

THE
PETERBOROUGH
Version of the
Anglo-Saxon
Chronicle

Rewriting
Post-Conquest
History

Malasree Home

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM

THE PETERBOROUGH VERSION OF
THE ANGLO-SAXON CHRONICLE

Anglo-Saxon Studies

ISSN 1475-2468

GENERAL EDITORS

John Hines

Catherine Cubitt

'Anglo-Saxon Studies' aims to provide a forum for the best scholarship on the Anglo-Saxon peoples in the period from the end of Roman Britain to the Norman Conquest, including comparative studies involving adjacent populations and periods; both new research and major re-assessments of central topics are welcomed.

Books in the series may be based in any one of the principal disciplines of archaeology, art history, history, language and literature, and inter- or multi-disciplinary studies are encouraged.

Proposals or enquiries may be sent directly to the editors or the publisher at the addresses given below; all submissions will receive prompt and informed consideration.

Professor John Hines, School of History, Archaeology and Religion,
Cardiff University, John Percival Building, Colum Drive, Cardiff, Wales,
CF10 3EU, UK

Professor Catherine Cubitt, Centre for Medieval Studies, University of
York, The King's Manor, York, England, YO1 7EP, UK

Boydell & Brewer, PO Box 9, Woodbridge, Suffolk, England, IP12 3DF, UK

Previously published volumes in the series are listed at the back of this book

THE PETERBOROUGH VERSION OF
THE ANGLO-SAXON CHRONICLE

Rewriting Post-Conquest History

Malasree Home

THE BOYDELL PRESS

© Malasree Home 2015

All Rights Reserved. Except as permitted under current legislation no part of this work may be photocopied, stored in a retrieval system, published, performed in public, adapted, broadcast, transmitted, recorded or reproduced in any form or by any means, without the prior permission of the copyright owner

The right of Malasree Home to be identified as the author of this work has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988

First published 2015
The Boydell Press, Woodbridge

ISBN 978-1-78327-001-9

The Boydell Press is an imprint of Boydell & Brewer Ltd
PO Box 9, Woodbridge, Suffolk IP12 3DF, UK
and of Boydell & Brewer Inc.
668 Mt Hope Avenue, Rochester, NY 14620-2731, USA
website: www.boydellandbrewer.com

The publisher has no responsibility for the continued existence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this book, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

A CIP catalogue record for this book is available
from the British Library

This publication is printed on acid-free paper

Contents

Acknowledgements	vii
Abbreviations	viii
List of Manuscripts	ix
Introduction: The text, the world, and Peterborough abbey	1
1 Textualising the past	21
2 Continuing the <i>Chronicle</i>	61
3 Making the <i>Chronicle</i> : form, genre, identity	101
4 Beyond the <i>Chronicle</i> : the perspective of house history	143
Bibliography	173
Index	181

Acknowledgements

The author of this monograph owes a debt of gratitude to all those who made constructive criticisms in its various stages, from its inception to its conclusion. Particular thanks are due to the reviewers; their insightful comments greatly improved the focus of this study.

Thanks are also due to the staff of the British Library, the Cambridge University Library, and the Robinson Library, Newcastle University, who made life easier in all stages of my research.

The progress of this monograph has certainly been slowed down by the arrival of my daughter, but she has also made life more worthwhile. The final word, however, is reserved for my husband, for without his unfailing support at all times, this book would never have happened.

Malasree Home
2014

Abbreviations

<i>ASE</i>	<i>Anglo-Saxon England</i>
EEMF	Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile
EETS	Early English Text Society
<i>EHR</i>	<i>English Historical Review</i>
<i>Hugh Candidus</i>	<i>Chronicle of Hugh Candidus</i>
OMT	Oxford Medieval Texts
<i>RES</i>	<i>Review of English Studies</i>
RS	Rolls Series
WA	<i>Waverley Annals</i>

List of Manuscripts

Versions of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 173: Version A (the *Parker Chronicle*)

London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A vi: Version B

London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B i: Version C

London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B iv: Version D

Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud Misc. 636: Version E (the *Peterborough Chronicle*)

London, British Library, Cotton Domitian viii: Version F

London, British Library, Cotton Otho B xi: Version G

London, British Library, Cotton Domitian ix, fol. 9: Version H

Other associated manuscripts

Cambridge, Cambridge University Library, Dd. 14. 28

London, British Library, Add. MS 39758

London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius C i

London, British Library, Harley 3667

London, British Library, Stowe 57

London, Society of Antiquaries, 60

Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 163

Peterborough, Dean and Chapter, MS 1

Introduction

The text, the world, and Peterborough abbey

The Peterborough text

In the early part of the twelfth century, the Benedictine abbey of Peterborough saw a spate of textual activity. Of principal importance for this study is an example of vernacular historiography acquired and subsequently reworked by the abbey scriptorium. This was a version of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, which started life as a document of national history and West-Saxon military campaigns now known in *Chronicle* scholarship as the 'Common Stock'.¹ Peterborough abbey obtained a version of the Northern Recension, a version of the 'Common Stock' without any continuations, which was taken north in the late tenth or early eleventh centuries. This text is substantially different from some of the other *Chronicle* versions in having a Preface from Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica*, and narratives of the reign of King Æthelred and the opening years of Cnut's reign. In its stage before Peterborough, this text seems to have been located at Christ Church, Canterbury. By then, it had already incorporated annals 1023–1061, (written at St Augustine's, Canterbury), and the unlocalised annals 1062–1121.² This composite pre-Peterborough version (the Northern Recension, with annals 1023–1061 and 1062–1121), referred to in *Chronicle* scholarship as √E or the proto-E text, was extensively used as reference, and modified, by the compiler of a bilingual *Chronicle* based at Canterbury (the F version of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*). It is very likely that this proto-E text then moved to Peterborough from Canterbury, and became the basis of the *Peterborough Chronicle*.³ Interpolations concerning the early history of the abbey were made in this *Chronicle* version, and the manuscript was continued further in

¹ Following Janet M. Bately, ed., *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* 3. MS A (Cambridge, 1986), p. lxxiii. Also see Janet M. Bately, 'Compilation of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle once more', *Leeds Studies in English*, ns 16 (1985), 7–26, particularly pp. 9–19.

² These may or may not have originated at Canterbury. Clark noted 'a slight Westminster (or London) bias' in these annals; see Cecily Clark, ed., *The Peterborough Chronicle 1070–1154*, 2nd edn (Oxford, 1970), pp. xxii–xxiii.

³ For a survey of the links between Canterbury and Peterborough see Chapter 3, pp. 111–20.

the twelfth century at Peterborough. This modified text is known as the E version of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*.

A number of factors are of paramount importance here. The first is that twelfth-century Peterborough obtained a text belonging to an established textual tradition as far as historiography in the vernacular was concerned. The *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* had had its origins in the context of the Alfredian literary renaissance in the ninth century, and *Chronicle* versions had been copied and maintained in other ecclesiastical centres.⁴ The use of (at least) two *Chronicle* versions by the compiler of the near contemporary F text at Canterbury also implies that versions of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* were considered authoritative examples of vernacular historiography.⁵ A version of the proto-E was also accessed after 1128 by the compiler of the Latin *Annales de Waverleia*, based at the abbey of Waverley (subsequently referred to here as the *Waverley Annals* or WA), which translates into Latin, practically word for word, annals from the proto-E version, without the Peterborough additions and continuations.⁶ A *Chronicle* text similar to the proto-E was also used by John of Worcester and Henry of Huntingdon, though both chroniclers combined information drawn from this text with various other sources, and the correspondences are nowhere so exact as the WA.⁷

A fire at Peterborough abbey in 1116 had destroyed part of the premises, and it seems logical to assume that the incident contributed

⁴ For general accounts of how the various *Chronicle* versions were compiled and disseminated, see the introductions in C. Plummer, ed., *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel*, 2 vols (Oxford, 1892–99), pp. xxiii–cxxii, and Dorothy Whitelock, *English Historical Documents, c.500–1042* (London, 1979), pp. 109–25. A survey of the relationships between versions A, B and C may be found in Janet M. Bately, *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: Texts and Textual Relationships*, Reading Medieval Studies Monograph 3 (Reading, 1991), pp. 2–25. The introductions to the versions published as part of the Collaborative Edition series also present detailed accounts of the dissemination of a particular version. For a schematic overview of *Chronicle* transmission, see Malasree Home, 'The Peterborough Chronicle and the Writing of History in the Twelfth Century' (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Cambridge, 2005), Appendix I.

⁵ For the use of the A and VE versions, see P. S. Baker, ed., *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle 8. MS F* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. xxxviii–xliii. The F version is most contemporary to the E version, being no later than 1120, see *ibid.*, p. xxx, note 5, 'A later limit for F is set by the use of a copy of the MS by Lambert of St Omer in his *Liber Floridus*, c.1120.'

⁶ The Cistercian abbey of Waverley was founded in 1128. From 1000 to 1121 the WA incorporate annals in translation from a version of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* remarkably similar to the E text. While Luard posited that the version drawn upon by the text was E itself (Henry Richards Luard, ed., *Annales Monastici* II, RS 36 (London, 1865), p. xxxiii), Clark posited that they went back to a common source, see Clark, ed., *Peterborough Chronicle*, p. xx. For the broader relation between vernacular and Latin historiography, see Chapter 3, pp. 120–133.

⁷ See Diana Greenway, ed., *Henry of Huntingdon: Historia Anglorum*, OMT (Oxford, 1996), pp. xci–xcviii, and P. McGurk, ed., *The Chronicle of John of Worcester, Vol. III: The Annals from 1067 to 1140 with the Gloucester Interpolations and the Continuations till 1141*, OMT (Oxford, 1998), pp. xx–xxvi. This is discussed in detail in Chapter 3, pp. 120–34.

in part to a reorganisation of abbey records, and the acquisition of new texts.⁸ However, this story of the fire as the sole instigator for textual activity needs to be treated with a degree of caution, as we do know that a significant section of the abbey remained unscathed. The E text notes that the chapter house and the dormitory were not burned, and the later Peterborough *Chronicle of Hugh Candidus* (subsequently referred to as *Hugh Candidus*) further adds that the privy and the new refectory were saved.⁹ There is also no evidence that any texts were destroyed. Yet, as the subsequent chapters demonstrate, the motif of the fire remains a powerful element in the Peterborough narrative, making its appearance not just in the Interpolations, but also in the narrative of the Second Continuation, when a new building, rebuilt after the fire during the abbacy of Martin, is inaugurated.¹⁰ The drive to obtain texts and documents to boost the abbey archives could also have been part of a general post-Conquest trend of preserving, archiving, and even generating texts relevant to local identity; subsequent chapters will demonstrate the importance of local ideologies in the production of texts at twelfth-century Peterborough. It has also been suggested that the text of the *Chronicle* was obtained during the abbacy of Ernulf (1107–1114), who had significant links with Canterbury.¹¹ Ernulf had studied under Lanfranc at Bec, and had then joined the monks of Christ Church, Canterbury after 1070. This period may also have seen the acquisition of model texts from Canterbury for the construction of Peterborough forgeries, and there is sufficient evidence to suggest that new texts were being constructed at Peterborough in the 1120s and later. A Latin proto house-history, the *Relatio Heddae*, may have pre-dated the construction of the E text, and the twelfth century also saw the construction of Peterborough abbey's earliest cartulary, the *Liber Niger*.¹²

⁸ Susan Irvine, ed., *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* 7. MS E (Cambridge, 2004), p. xiii.

⁹ The *Chronicle of Hugh Candidus* was a Latin house-history of the abbey, possibly written soon after the final instalment of the vernacular *Chronicle*. For the text, see W. T. Mellows, ed., *The Chronicle of Hugh Candidus, a Monk of Peterborough* (Oxford, 1949). A version of this was part of the Peterborough cartulary (London, British Library, Cotton MS Otho A xvii), which perished in the Cottonian library fire of 1731. Mellows's text is based on the versions found in the cartularies of Robert of Swaffham (Peterborough, Dean and Chapter, MS 1) and Walter of Whittlesey (London, British Library, Additional MS 39758). The importance of this text in the context of text production at Peterborough is analysed in detail in Chapter 4, pp. 146–68.

¹⁰ See Chapter 1, p. 53, and Chapter 2, pp. 89–90.

¹¹ See Jennifer Paxton, 'Forging Communities: Memory and Identity in Post Conquest England', *Haskins Society Journal* 10 (2001), 95–109, particularly pp. 107–8, and S. E. Kelly, ed., *Charters of Peterborough Abbey* (Oxford, 2009), p. 11.

¹² The manuscript of the *Liber Niger* is now London, Society of Antiquaries, MS 60 (s. xii–xiii), fols 6–73; the *Relatio Heddae* is on fols 58v–71. The manuscript has been described by Janet Martin, *The Cartularies and Registers of Peterborough Abbey*, Northamptonshire Record Society (Peterborough, 1978), pp. 1–7. Also see Kelly, ed., *Charters of Peterborough Abbey*, pp. 86–8.

It is of importance that this *Chronicle* version was not only modified and given a Peterborough bias, but also continued further in two phases. The First Continuation was written around the time the Interpolations were incorporated into the $\sqrt{E}$ (around 1121), its 'scribal blocks' indicating contemporary composition.¹³ The Second Continuation was written largely in retrospect about twenty years later around 1154/55, probably during the early part of the reign of Henry II whose accession is noted.¹⁴ These twelfth-century continuations of the E text, along with the fact that this is, in some cases, the only extant *Chronicle* version to note post-Conquest events, have caused it to be highly rated as a historiographical document detailing contemporary events.¹⁵ Plummer considered it to be a 'living' chronicle, though it is doubtful whether his criteria are valid today.¹⁶ Strictly speaking, the *Peterborough Chronicle* presents us with a contemporary account of twelfth-century events only for the period 1121–1131, and that too an account which is highly biased towards Peterborough abbey. We have no idea about whether the annals before 1121 were written contemporaneously or not, as they remain unlocalised, and the annals after 1131 (1132–1154) were written in retrospect, and in a single scribal stint, almost twenty years after the events had occurred.¹⁷

Nevertheless it is indeed significant that this text was continued in the vernacular at a time when most contemporary historiography was in Latin. At the same time, this vernacular text interacts with Latin

¹³ See Irvine, ed., *MS E*, p. xviii–xxii for a description of this scribal hand. See also N. R. Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon* (Oxford, 1957; reprinted with supplement, 1990), p. 425, and Dorothy Whitelock, ed., *The Peterborough Chronicle*, EEMF 4 (Copenhagen, 1954), p. 14.

¹⁴ See Irvine, ed., *MS E*, pp. xviii and xxii–xxiii.

¹⁵ The state of the extant *Chronicle* versions is, needless to say, partly responsible for this editorial bias. By the time the E text was being compiled and composed at Peterborough, the A text had already changed its linguistic identity. The B version is certainly consulted and insertions made, though the *Chronicle* text itself remains untouched. Version C shows evidence of conscious compilation, and is perhaps written into in the twelfth century in an effort to preserve the manuscript. There is no definite evidence that it was actively continued by inserting post-Conquest annals around that time. D seems to be a compilation which is sporadically kept up. At around 1130, only one entry is added, and if there were any efforts to continue D, they are not apparent. How far version F was actively maintained is also not known given that the extant version ends mutilated at 1058; similarly no definite conclusions about active chronicling may be drawn from the fragmentary H. For a survey of the state of the *Chronicle* versions in the twelfth century, see below, pp. 11–16.

¹⁶ Plummer, ed., *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel*, II, xlv–xlv.

¹⁷ Baker does note that Plummer does not apply the same standards in judging all *Chronicle* versions: 'If our test for the "historical value" of *Chronicle* texts is that they must be contemporary records of events rather than copies of older chronicles, then most manuscripts will barely pass: with the single, magnificent exception of A, the chronicles Plummer mentions as "living" are contemporary records only briefly – for at most about twenty years of the thousand to twelve hundred they cover.' See Baker, ed., *MS F*, p. xxviii.

Introduction

texts of Peterborough origin, and even incorporates generic features of alternative forms of historiography (for example, cartularies), something not sufficiently recognised in critical considerations of post-Conquest historiography in general, and the *Chronicle* in particular.¹⁸ From the very start, it is essential to draw attention to this cultural hybridity of the E text – it is simultaneously part of a received tradition of vernacular history, as well as a new text constructed from scratch at a particular moment in time, within a specific local, cultural and literary milieu. This feature is not unique to this version of the *Chronicle*, but is one shared with the near-contemporary F version produced at Canterbury.¹⁹ The presence of two post-Conquest versions of the *Chronicle* (at the very least) exhibiting similar trends therefore begs for a re-evaluation of not just the historicity of the E text, but of our critical perception of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* as a whole.

Multiplicity and identity

Traditional approaches

The very existence of the many versions of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* has caused *Chronicle* scholarship to navigate between the treacherous rocks of tradition, identity, multiplicity and fragmentation. The more traditional studies have tended to focus on the source of the texts, a hypothetically ‘perfect’ ur-text, with all extant *Chronicle* versions being seen as deviants from the complete and composite *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. Such studies have stressed the origins of the *Chronicle*, its routes of transmission, and the complex links between the versions. This has invariably led to a study of the differences and similarities between the texts, but, even more importantly, it has provided the idea of the *Chronicle* as a coherent unified construct, albeit unravelled partially by time. This implies the possibility of solving the jigsaw puzzle posed by the various versions, and, in doing so, theoretically constructing the mother of all versions. This perfect ‘Common Stock’ version was denoted as Æ in a grand gesture by Plummer after the first letter in ‘Ælfred’, and because it gives rise to both the A and the E versions.²⁰ This is not to deny that all versions of the *Anglo-Saxon*

¹⁸ The E text incorporates Peterborough diplomatic texts in summary, and even makes reference to external documentation. The interpolations derived from Peterborough diplomatic are discussed in Chapter 1 of this study, and the interaction of language and genre forms the subject of Chapter 3, pp. 135–41.

¹⁹ For a detailed analysis of the F text, see Baker, ed., *MS F*, pp. ix–lxxxi.

²⁰ Plummer, ed., *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel II*, p. cv.

Chronicle share certain commonalities, but nevertheless, despite changes in the focus of *Chronicle* scholarship over the years, this idea of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* as a unified entity remains, as we shall see, a persistent legacy.

At the same time, the very multiplicity of versions of the *Chronicle* was emphasised as a characteristic of its nature. Benjamin Thorpe's ground-breaking edition in 1861 called it 'The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, according to the Several Original Authorities', and printed extracts from the various versions in parallel so that their contents could be compared or collated.²¹ The editorial principle of collation rests on the idea that by being textually interlinked, the *Chronicle* versions in some way supplement each other, so that where one version is lacking, another can fill in the missing gaps in information. In its philosophy, it implies that the *Chronicle* versions, by themselves, are somehow incomplete without being compared to other parallel texts. In practice, this method is no different from the F compiler's use of as many *Chronicle* texts as possible in compiling his version. Nevertheless, as far *Chronicle* studies is concerned, this process has never been whole-heartedly critiqued, and it has been a tradition that has been continued by most editors and translators, including Plummer, Whitelock, Garmonsway, and Michael Swanton.²² All editions highlight the plural nature of the text(s), and while they may give an indication of the textual differences and linguistic or lexical choices made by the compilers of the various versions, they do not convey an awareness of the unique identity of the text as a whole. They also imply that, because of the presumed fragmented and incomplete state of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, the 'literary' and 'annalistic' parts of the texts may be easily disassociated, and studies have focussed on examples of poetry (the *Battle of Brunanburh* or the *Capture of the Five Boroughs*) or narrative (the episode of Cynewulf and Cyneheard) as independent sections of the *Chronicle* rather than being integral parts of particular versions, each with their unique textual contents and features.²³

²¹ Benjamin Thorpe, ed., *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, According to the Several Original Authorities*, 2 vols, RS 23 (London, 1861).

²² See Plummer, ed., *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel*; Dorothy Whitelock, D. C. Douglas and S. I. Tucker, eds, *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Revised Translation* (London, 1965); G. N. Garmonsway, *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (London and New York, 1953); and M. J. Swanton, *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicles*, revised edn (London 2000).

²³ Matthew Townend, for example, has suggested that both *Brunanburh* and *Five Boroughs* may have had an independent existence as 'praise-poetry' outside their textual existence in the *Chronicle* manuscripts, in a culture that was particularly conducive to their production, see M. Townend, 'Pre-Cnut Praise-Poetry in Viking Age England', *RES* ns 51 (2000), 349–70, particularly pp. 351–6. For the story of Cynewulf and Cyneheard in annal 757, see Stephen D. White, 'Kinship and Lordship in Early Medieval England: The Story of Sigebert, Cynewulf, and Cyneheard', *Viator* 20 (1989), pp. 1–18, and Rolf

New directions

All *Chronicle* versions ultimately derive from the 'Common Stock', but it also needs to be realised that they were based at various centres, each version thus having a distinctive identity, character and ideological bias. For example, the A text shows a marked West Saxon royal bias in its tenth-century portions, particularly through the incorporation of royal genealogies, origin-legends and praise-poetry, but its later Canterbury bias is equally evident by its continuation as the *Acta Lanfranci*. Version G, copied from the A version, continues the focus on the West-Saxon dynasty, but also seems to preserve some of the earlier features of the A text, besides being associated with a particular centre, Winchester. Version D shows a clear interest in Scottish affairs, and the F version leaves no doubt regarding its Canterbury origins, both in scribal appearance and contents. The E text incorporates notices and diplomatic texts of Peterborough origin, and the two Continuations, despite a change in compiler, retain their interest in the fluctuating fortunes of Peterborough abbey.

The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Collaborative Edition was a massive and ambitious project which, for the very first time, focused on each *Chronicle* version as a unique text. The editions consider the individual physical, linguistic and scribal characteristics of the versions, but also address issues of provenance and inter-textual relationships. To date, nine versions are in print.²⁴ The scope of this project was to produce semi-diplomatic editions, and therefore the volumes do not incorporate a detailed analysis of the contents of the manuscripts, nor are the sources discussed from the perspective of contextual incorporation. Nevertheless, the impact that this project has had on *Chronicle* scholarship cannot be overemphasised, and recent studies of the *Chronicle*, including this one, owe a debt to this project for its focus on the unique historicity of an individual version, rather than seeing them as differences from other versions. These editions have also provided updated versions of the *Chronicle* versions, which are invaluable for a detailed analysis. In all instances, this particular study refers to the text and comprehensive scholarship of the edition of the *Peterborough Chronicle* by Susan Irvine.

Some studies of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* have also deviated from earlier trends by focussing on the *Chronicle* as a cultural phenomenon,

Bremner, 'The Germanic Context of "Cynewulf and Cyneheard" Revisited', *Neophilologus* 81 (1997), 445–65.

²⁴ These include versions A (vol. 2), B (vol. 4), C (vol. 5), C with reference to BDE, *The Abingdon Chronicle* (vol. 10), D (vol. 6), E (vol. 7), F (vol. 8), a facsimile of version F (vol. 1), and the *Annals of St Neots with Vita Prima Sancti Neoti* (vol. 17).

embodying different constructs of identity. Two significant monographs here are by Thomas Bredehoft and Alice Sheppard,²⁵ which focus on themes and categories within the *Chronicle* as a whole, rather than looking at the individual manuscript versions. Bredehoft focuses on the formal elements, while Sheppard focuses on the narratological elements of the texts. Both these studies are important for our perception of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, and for *Chronicle* studies, as both mark the critical interest in this subject, and are indicative of changing approaches in scholarship.²⁶ Nevertheless, their focus on the *Chronicle* as a single unit (perhaps a natural feature of looking at the *Chronicle* versions as a single cultural construct) tends to draw attention away from the unique nature of each version, and the similarities, as well as the considerable differences in their production and construction.

Alice Sheppard, looking at lordship obligations in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, focuses on how identity is centred on the relationship between the lord (or the figure of the king) and his subjects. Despite regarding the *Chronicle* texts as a cultural unit, Sheppard's study does make the very valid point at the start that studies of the *Chronicle* have been dominated by a focus on the manuscript traditions.

[B]y focussing ... on the idea that their texts have been altered to fit the circumstances in which they were written, we have allowed the problems of the manuscript tradition to dominate the critical conversation. If we persist in not interpreting the very things that make the annals difficult to read – the narrative strategies of the various annalists, the relationships of the texts to their political, cultural, and textual contexts, and the relationship of the annals to other kinds of medieval historical

²⁵ See T. A. Bredehoft, *Textual Histories: Readings in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (Toronto, 2001) and Alice Sheppard, *Families of the King: Writing Identity in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (Toronto, 2004).

²⁶ See Jaqueline Stodnick, 'Second-rate Stories? Changing Approaches to the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle', *Literature Compass* 3 (2006), 1253–65, and Pauline Stafford, 'Reading the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: Language, Literature, History by Alice Jorgensen', *EHR* 127, no. 527 (2012), 954–56 for an overall review of recent critical approaches to the *Chronicle*. Stafford's review article draws together a range of perspectives on the various versions of the *Chronicle*, and also draws attention to the increased use of literary approaches in studying the *Chronicle*. The volume edited by Jorgensen (*Reading the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, *Studies in the Early Middle Ages* 23 (Turnhout, 2010)) is thus testament to the resurgence of interest in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, and in her Introduction to the volume Jorgensen pays particular attention to the plurality of the *Chronicle* (*ibid.*, pp. 4–5). However the many scholarly perspectives collected in this volume necessarily result in a plurality of critical approaches as well, thus making this volume markedly different in comparison to the studies by Bredehoft and Sheppard. Nevertheless, this collection of scholarship marks an important milestone in *Chronicle* studies, and some articles in this volume have been extensively referred to in this monograph, see particularly Chapters 2 and 3 (p. 72 and p. 129 respectively).

Introduction

writing – the *Chronicle* will continue, even as scholars champion Old English prose, to be the discipline's ugly duckling.²⁷

The principal focus of Sheppard's study is thematic, and she analyses the narratives of rule, power and conquest (for example, the accession of Alfred, the reign of Ethelred and Cnut, or the Norman Conquest) across all versions of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. At the crux of Sheppard's study is a textual concept of the ideal relationship between a lord and his subjects, the presence, or absence, of which, characterises the narrative of kings in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. Sheppard contends that the portrayal of the rule of King Alfred in the *Chronicle* suggests that 'Alfred gains and maintains Wessex by virtue of his strong lordship relations', and that his 'performance of lordship becomes an identifying ethos or culture for the new Anglo-Saxon realm'.²⁸ By contrast, the Norman Conquest and the accession of William mark 'the end of Anglo-Saxon lordship culture and the consequent loss of Anglo-Saxon identity associated with that culture'.²⁹ Sheppard's analysis of lordship relations and obligations considers the *Chronicle* as a cultural and thematic whole rather than as separate texts. Even though this study is nuanced by considering the manuscript circumstances of the *Chronicle* versions, her survey of the idea of lordship, and its role in constructing Anglo-Saxon identity at different points of time, seems to imply that the concept of what lordship meant in society was fairly uniformly held by all annalists from the ninth to the eleventh centuries, and is directly reflected in their narrative in the *Chronicle*. At the same time, the study remains somewhat selective in its approach, concluding with the narrative of the Norman Conquest, and not taking into account any later assessments of rule and kingship, as for example, the estimate of the rule of Henry I in the First and Second Continuations at Peterborough.

Bredehoff's study of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* is overarching in its scope, and focuses in great detail on the very form and structure of the *Chronicle* as an exercise in genre. He draws attention to the heterogeneous components of *Chronicle* narrative, and considers how these contribute to the ideological construct of the *Chronicle* as a cultural icon. More important for the purpose of this study is Bredehoff's idea that all heterogeneous elements contribute to the idea of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* as a coherent unit. While this is not the place to discuss all the elements of this study, a case in point is the analysis of the poetry present in the *Chronicle*. The question of 'poetry' in the various versions has usually raised extreme critical

²⁷ Sheppard, *Families of the King*, pp. 4–5.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 28.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 121.

opinions, with editors arguing about the presence and absence of metre, and the number of passages that could be considered 'poetic'.³⁰ Bredehoft moderates masterfully between extreme critical attitudes by taking into consideration all the 'poetic' portions, but his scope, encompassing all versions of the *Chronicle*, also sees these passages as sharing a common cultural substratum, a 'well recognized and culturally powerful' tradition of verse.³¹ The assumption that the inclusion of these passages in the *Chronicle* texts implies a uniformity of awareness behind their different stages of incorporation enables Bredehoft to demarcate their 'key features':

The key features of the *Chronicle* poems as a group ... are ... a concern with English nationalism, an explicit focus on the royal succession in the West Saxon line, and a tendency to make historical comparisons, writing about relatively current happenings in comparison to more remote events.³²

However, this attitude of overarching unification tends to gloss over the immediate textual context of these 'poems', and the fact that all versions may not be equally representative of the general trend marked out above. This is certainly true of the *Peterborough Chronicle*, which not only does not contain the well-known 'canonical' *Chronicle* poems (the *Battle of Brunanburh*, the *Capture of Five Boroughs*, the *Coronation of Edgar* and the extended version of the *Death of Edgar*), but also contains passages that are more of a mixed medley, and seem to exhibit features that are more in line with late medieval pulpit poetry of protest and social commentary.³³ Considering all these passages in their textual context, it becomes increasingly difficult to mark out features of 'English nationalism' or 'an explicit focus on the royal succession in the West Saxon line' in them. Bredehoft's study also demonstrates that even though *Chronicle* scholarship claims to have moved away from transmission politics and differences between

³⁰ The critical dilemmas regarding the presentation of 'poetic' passages in a printed text have been succinctly summarised by Bredehoft (*Textual Histories*, pp. 72–7).

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 99.

³² *Ibid.*, pp. 99–100. However, Jayne Carroll notes that the tenth-century *Chronicle* poems do not necessarily demonstrate uniformity of approach and structure, but 'are united through their function as annals in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, and because they have historical events as their subjects'. See Jayne Carroll, 'Poetic Discourse in Viking Age England: Texts and Contexts' (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Nottingham University, 2001), pp. 62–147.

³³ The E text contains two passages on Edgar, one each on the martyrdom of Edward, the capture of Archbishop Ælfheah and King William, and assorted verses *s.a.* 1075 and 1104. For a consideration of these passages in the E text as having links with the pulpit, and sharing features more in common with the pulpit verse of the late medieval period than with the canonical *Chronicle* poems, see Malasree Home, "'These things we have written about him": the Portrait of King William in "The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle" 1086E', *Anglo-Saxon* 1 (2007), 239–68.

various versions, the ghostly idea of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* as a single (albeit conglomerate) entity, with a common aim in construction, still persists. Nevertheless, the importance of these studies should not be underestimated, as they mark critical departures from earlier considerations of the *Chronicle* as a collated witness to history. This focus on the text as a cultural artefact at a certain moment in time is continued in the present study, both in a local context, and within the context of a wider tradition of vernacular and Latin historiography.

This brief summary of *Chronicle* scholarship thus suggests that any generalisations regarding the nature of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* as a whole may not be valid upon a close consideration of the individual *Chronicle* manuscripts. Local factors of construction, and, in particular, the very different transmission routes taken by the various *Chronicle* versions in the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries, play an important part in constructing the manuscripts' unique identities.³⁴

The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle(s)

All versions of the *Chronicle*, each with its unique transmission history, are marked not only by the manner in which they started, but also by the way in which they ended. Despite a perceived commonality in their origins, by the first half of the twelfth century (which is when the E text was being constructed at Peterborough abbey) all extant versions of the *Chronicle* had gone their separate ways. By the 1120s, at a first glance, most *Chronicle* versions seem to have mutated or become stagnant. Version A reached Christ Church, Canterbury by the late eleventh century, certainly by 1075, where it was used by the compiler of F.³⁵ At around the same time, though not by the same scribe who compiled F, the *Acta Lanfranci* was written into the annal for 1070.³⁶ It cannot have been composed before 1075, which was the approximate time when the *Scriptum Lanfranci de Primatu*, the Latin original from which it is derived, was written.³⁷ Annal 1070 begins in Old English, but is continued in Latin. The *Acta Lanfranci* seems

³⁴ In addition to the subsequent discussion, see Table 1 in 'Introduction' in Jorgensen, ed., *Reading the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, pp. 6–7, for a survey of the surviving manuscripts of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* and their dates and provenance.

³⁵ A transcript of A (version G) was made before it left for Canterbury and was retained at Winchester. See Bately, ed., *MS A*, p. xiii, and Plummer, ed., *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel*, II, pp. xcvi–c. It should be noted here that Plummer's *sigla* is slightly different from the conventions in current *Chronicle* scholarship. He refers to the A text as *Ā* and version G as *A*.

³⁶ Bately, ed., *MS A*, p. xlii; the scribe of the *Acta* is noted as *Hand 13*.

³⁷ D. N. Dumville, 'Some Aspects of Annalistic Writing at Canterbury in the Eleventh and Early Twelfth Centuries', *Peritia* 2 (1983), 23–57, p. 42, n. 2.

to have been written over erased annal numbers, though some annal markers are retained in the Latin text.³⁸ While Dumville attributes the existing annal numbers to the scribe of the *Acta Lanfranci*, he mentions in a significant footnote that the annal numbers may have been present and then some of them erased.³⁹ These annal numbers, erased yet partly retained, are physical markers of the change in language and narrative focus from the national to the solely ecclesiastical – the *Chronicle* version once exhibiting a marked West Saxon royal bias is continued in the eleventh century as an account of the episcopate of Lanfranc. Version A of the *Chronicle* is written into in the early twelfth century: insertions are made into the attached list of popes who sent the *pallium* to Canterbury around this time in a twelfth-century hand very like the one which writes a similar list in version B. Another scribe adds ‘Paschalis Radulfo’ to the list, certainly not before 1115, as the words relate to an event of that year.⁴⁰

Version B of the *Chronicle* extends only to 977 and is generally written in a tenth-century hand. At around 1100 two brief additions were made, by which date it was probably at Christ Church, Canterbury.⁴¹ In the list of popes in B, the editor of the text discerns three hands. One belongs to the scribe of F, a second one belongs to the scribe of the *Acta Lanfranci*, and there is a third similar to the second hand, perhaps from the same scriptorium, thus making the connection with Christ Church stronger.⁴² The material was inserted in the late eleventh or the early twelfth century, not earlier than 1095 when Archbishop Anselm received the *pallium*.

Version C, usually identified as an Abingdon text, seems to have been compiled around 1044.⁴³ The similar layout and design of the other texts compiled with it, the Old English version of *Orosius*, the *Menologium* and the *Maxims II*, clearly points to an institutional project.⁴⁴ The first hand of the *Chronicle* writes the poems, and the

³⁸ See Bately, ed., *MS A*, pp. 83–9, where the existing as well as erased annal numbers are marked in the notes accompanying the text of the *Acta*.

³⁹ Dumville, ‘Some Aspects’, p. 42.

⁴⁰ Bately, ed., *MS A*, p. xliii.

⁴¹ Simon Taylor, ed., *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle 4. MS B* (Cambridge, 1983), p. xi.

⁴² *Ibid.*, p. xxi.

⁴³ This Abingdon origin was mentioned by Joscelyn, and argued for by Plummer, and more recently by Conner (Patrick W. Conner, ed., *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle 10: The Abingdon Chronicle, A.D. 956–1066* (Cambridge, 1996)). However, Katherine O’Brien O’Keeffe has suggested a Canterbury attribution for version C, and has argued in her edition that ‘there are numerous difficulties with assigning an Abingdon origin to B and C, indeed to √BC’ (p. lxxviii). She notes that the reasons for such an attribution rest on insufficient grounds and suggests ‘a Canterbury, rather than Abingdon, connection’ (p. xc), though ‘[f]urther work must be done on the evidence connecting the C-text to Canterbury, where considerable other chronicle activity went on’. For a detailed exposition of this stance see Katherine O’Brien O’Keeffe, ed., *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle 5. MS C* (Cambridge, 2001), pp. lxxiv–xcii.

Chronicle text begins at the bottom of the same page where *Maxims II* end, thus suggesting that 'the poems were considered appropriate prefatory matter to the *Chronicle* material'.⁴⁵ Eight lines of text are written in the hand of a twelfth-century scribe s.a. 1066. Plummer considered this account of the battle at Stamford Bridge to be inserted from oral tradition as it is written in far later language.⁴⁶ It may be more practical to assume that these annals were copied later and the original leaf discarded, as it was a cover leaf, though the possibility remains that the C text was continued 'through the account of the defeat at Hastings and possibly further'.⁴⁷

Version D is written in various hands belonging to the second half of the eleventh century or the early twelfth, which has led to the proposition that D was a conflation, perhaps a transcript of a previously compiled collection.⁴⁸ This has, in turn, led to questions about when this version was written, issues aggravated by the fact that this version ends in 1079, with an entry added about twenty years later around 1130, but miswritten 1080.⁴⁹ Plummer maintained that it was compiled in the twelfth century, while Whitelock maintained, based on a reference to Margaret of Scotland, that it was written after 1093, which is when a life of Margaret was written.⁵⁰ However, as Cubbin points out in the latest edition of this version, the references are explainable in a Worcester document, as Margaret was a personal acquaintance of the Archbishop Wulfstan.⁵¹ Annal 1080 (actually written around 1130) records the rebellion of Angus, Earl of Moray, and is seen as evidence of the D text's continuing interest in Scottish affairs. Dumville posited a date after 1066, and also claimed that the compiler of version D had access to a copy of the proto-E in a

⁴⁴ See Conner, ed., *The Abingdon Chronicle*, p. xxxv. Conner further notes, on p. xxxiv, that the time would be propitious as King Edward had been consecrated at Winchester in the Easter of 1043.

⁴⁵ O'Brien O'Keeffe, ed., *MS C*, p. xv. For a description of the manuscript and its composite nature see pp. xx–xxv. The manuscript begins with the *Old English Orosius*, followed by the *Menologium* and *Maxims II*, and finally by the C text.

⁴⁶ See Plummer, ed., *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel*, II, p. xciii.

⁴⁷ Conner, ed., *The Abingdon Chronicle*, pp. xxix–xxx, merely suggests twelfth-century maintenance of the C manuscript. O'Brien O'Keeffe, ed., *MS C*, pp. lxxii–lxxiii, on the other hand, suggests the possibility of a twelfth-century continuation of C, though noting that 'this assertion is incapable of proof'.

⁴⁸ See Plummer, ed., *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel*, II, pp. lxxix–lxxxiii; also see G. P. Cubbin, ed., *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle 6. MS D* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. liii–lv.

⁴⁹ Dumville, 'Some Aspects', p. 36, refers to the entry for 1079 and notes 'the curious fact that D, as it stands, ends with a statement which could be taken to imply weariness or boredom'.

⁵⁰ See Plummer, ed., *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel*, II, p. lxxviii, and Whitelock, *English Historical Documents*, I, p. 115.

⁵¹ Cubbin, ed., *MS D*, p. lxxiv.

physically complex state.⁵² D was probably compiled by 1120 before the proto-E became the basis of the extant Peterborough text as, despite correspondences between D and E, the Norman annals in the E text are entirely absent from the D version.⁵³

The bilingual version F was compiled at Christ Church, Canterbury in the late eleventh or early twelfth century. Besides drawing on other versions of the *Chronicle*, particularly version A, the F compiler also drew on a variety of sources like Canterbury house records, diplomatic texts and Norman annals. This compiler also seems to have had access to a version of the Northern Recension with its standard prefatorial matter and additions, along with annals 1023–1061 written at St. Augustine's, Canterbury, to which he added more material from the Norman annals. This proto-E, modified at Canterbury and containing the unlocalised annals 1062–1121, then becomes the basis of the *Peterborough Chronicle*. Though nearly contemporary to the writing of the *Chronicle* at Peterborough, the mutilated manuscript of the F text makes it difficult to determine its status as an 'active' text when the E text was being compiled. Nevertheless, it indicates a connection between Canterbury and Peterborough, which is discussed in greater detail later.⁵⁴

This summary of the state of the *Chronicle* versions in the eleventh and twelfth centuries allows us to discern certain general trends. There is definitely a change in the format and focus of the manuscripts, with an overall tendency towards bilingualism. Version A undergoes a linguistic transmutation, and vernacular and Latin elements co-exist and interact in the other versions. The F version of the *Chronicle* was conceived as a bilingual chronicle from its inception, though it is different from most bilingual texts in having its Old English portions at the head of its Latin text portions. A bilingual element is introduced into the E text (via the proto-E) by the F scribe (through the

⁵² Dumville, 'Some Aspects', see pp. 34 and 37.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, pp. 36–8. Dumville also suggests that the compiler of version D may have had access to a physically complex version of the proto-E, where the absent material was clearly marked out as insertions or annotations.

⁵⁴ See Chapter 3, pp. 111–20. In addition to F, two late *Chronicle* variants also need to be considered here. The text Plummer refers to as I is a Paschal table which has brief historical notices entered in the margin (London, British Library, Cotton MS Caligula A. xv, fols 120–53, printed by Felix Liebermann, *Ungedruckte Anglonormannische Geschichtsquellen* (Strasbourg, 1879), pp. 1–8). It was probably compiled at Christ Church in the latter half of the eleventh century, and continued in various hands to 1268, changing its nature ultimately from a vernacular text to one in Latin. The fragment designated as H is also a late manuscript, containing information regarding ecclesiastical promotions belonging to the years 1113 and 1114 (London, British Library, Cotton MS Domitian ix, fol. 9, Ker Catalogue number 150). It is written in a more standardised West Saxon compared with the language of the Peterborough compilers, but its fragmentary state gives us no idea of its status when version E was being written. These variants will not be considered in any detail in this study.

insertion of Norman Annals), and this vernacular text also interacts with other contemporary Latin texts being constructed locally, a trend also exhibited by the A and F versions at Canterbury. There is also a distinct migratory trend – most *Chronicle* versions (certainly versions A, B, and F, possibly version D, and perhaps even version C) become associated with a single ecclesiastical centre, Christ Church, Canterbury, around 1100.⁵⁵ The activity here tends more towards transcription, compilation or marking of texts in the context of an ‘intensive overhaul of Christ Church records and house-traditions’.⁵⁶ However, despite most versions congregating at Canterbury in the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries, their contents remain individual and unique. The versions accessed by the scribe-compiler of the F version were sufficiently different for them to be used as source texts separately, and, as we know, the creation of the bilingual F text involved extensive textual comparison and collation. Further, despite the changes, insertions and deletions made by the F-compiler in these other *Chronicle* versions, the texts still retain a large measure of their individuality.

This very short overview of the evolution of the various *Chronicle* versions draws on a body of critical literature describing the transmission of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, aimed at establishing relations between the various versions. Yet, this overview also makes it apparent that a sole critical focus on the inter-textual relationships is bound to founder after a point simply because, in their extant states, the *Chronicle* versions reveal gaps in transmission, and different times of compilation or termination. Yet most critical studies have resolutely chosen to focus on the transmission history of the texts at the expense of the internal dynamics of each *Chronicle* version, and the ideological motives behind their compilation or construction. Transmission routes and schemas are essential in understanding how the variant *Chronicle* versions have developed over time, but this approach is also, in a sense, a backward looking exercise. This critical attitude of trying to go back to an earlier, more ‘perfect’ version of the text may be particularly susceptible to imbalances in perspective. For example, version A of the *Chronicle* is valorised because it represents a phase closest to the Common Stock, and the earlier ninth-century stage of the text is implicitly prioritised over its eleventh-century Canterbury phase. Similarly, at the opposite end, the longevity of the E text has usually been singled out as its predominant feature, and has usually formed the crux of critical attention.⁵⁷ The contemporary continuation of the text in the vernacular in the twelfth century has been seen

⁵⁵ Dumville, ‘Some Aspects’, pp. 33–55.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 50.

⁵⁷ See above, pp. 4–5.

as evidence of active chronicling, comparable to the contemporary writing of the *Chronicle* in the ninth and tenth centuries. Not only has less attention been paid to the actual contents of the E text at Peterborough, what has also not been realised is that actually only a part of the twelfth-century text (the First Continuation, written in the 1120s and 30s) is contemporary in the true sense. Both the Interpolations and the Second Continuation are written much later, and, as the subsequent analysis demonstrates, the perspective of the past plays a very important role in the construction of the narrative.

A deeper consideration of the *Chronicle* versions (particularly the circumstances of their production) reveals cracks in our perception of the purpose and aim of the texts themselves. It is therefore essential to see all *Chronicle* versions not only with respect to each other, but with respect to the particular cultural and textual milieu in which they were produced. Scholarship needs to place greater emphasis on the range of content that they might incorporate; it is also time to re-evaluate our critical perceptions, which cause us to rate the earlier recensions of the *Chronicle* texts higher than their post-Conquest forms. The writing of the *Chronicle* texts at all stages needs to be seen as much more than continuations of a received text, and it is this very basic argument that lies at the root of the present study.

The method in the madness

As discourse, the versions of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* participate in the textual culture in which they are constructed, but also change and mutate with time, and according to changes in circumstances. The transformation may involve linguistic change (as in the case of the A version incorporating the Latin *Acta Lanfranci*), but may also involve a textual reworking to link it to a particular centre of origin, as in the case of the E version. The centre, or *locus*, of the text is thus constantly displaced with each new reworking, and where King Alfred's court was portrayed as the centre of the world in its earlier phases, it is now a more localised geographical centre.⁵⁸ The *Peterborough Chronicle* is a particularly distinctive case, as the various phases of the text can be clearly differentiated, and a large portion of the text can be localised. It can also be definitively placed in the context of text production at Peterborough abbey in the twelfth century, and the authorial and compilatory choices made in its production may be compared with

⁵⁸ See Fabienne L. Michelet, *Creation, Migration, and Conquest: Imaginary Geography and Sense of Space in Old English Literature* (Oxford, 2006), p. 158.

similar choices made in contemporary or subsequent texts. In linking the construction of the E text to a physical centre of text production, it becomes easier not just to relate the *Peterborough Chronicle* to other contemporary and near-contemporary texts, but also to locate it in the overall context of text production in the twelfth century. The strong geographical identity of this text has important implications for the way in which the narrative articulates and constructs a communal identity, and this will be considered in greater detail in the following chapters.

As a part of a vernacular tradition of historiography, yet composed within what seems to be a predominantly Latinate culture, the *Peterborough Chronicle* is simultaneously a part of old and new historiographical trends, and forms a seminal part of medieval studies. This study will approach the text from a variety of literary, historical and cultural perspectives. Particular attention will be paid to the Peterborough text as a construct of identity, both local and national, but at the same time, attention will be drawn to the actual milieu of text construction not just at the abbey (e.g. the construction of cartularies and house-histories), but also in the wider world, as indicated by the close textual links with Canterbury, and the connections shared by the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* with historical works in Latin (for example, the WA, and texts by John of Worcester, William of Malmesbury and Henry of Huntingdon). Through its analysis of the *Chronicle* at Peterborough, this study argues, for the first time in *Chronicle* scholarship, that the process of formal and linguistic adaptation in the versions of the *Chronicle* (particularly in the post-Conquest period) should be seen as an organic process of change and mutation, rather than a decline of chronicling in the vernacular.

The study of historiography in the twelfth century has been traditionally dominated by named stalwarts of Latin historiography, and the writing of the *Chronicle* versions in the same period, mostly by anonymous compilers, has usually been considered as an activity which is marginal and subsidiary. Further, the editorial principle of considering *Chronicle* versions as collated texts has drawn attention away from the individuality of the texts themselves. Nevertheless, despite anonymous authorship, a close analysis of the *Chronicle* demonstrates unique interpretations of events and history, and a strong sense of identity. This is certainly the case for the versions produced at Canterbury and Peterborough, where the compiler's perspective on events and the choices made in ordering the narrative are evident. Further, as the case of Peterborough clearly shows, the way the *Chronicle* text was perceived and used is inseparable from local ideologies, and must be seen in context with other texts in Latin and vernacular. And, most importantly for our scholarly perception of the continuation of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, the case of the twelfth-

century *Peterborough Chronicle* is not something that can be viewed in isolation from *Chronicle* studies in general. Indeed, as a methodology, the focus of this study may as easily be extended to the other *Chronicle* versions, particularly those having phases that may be localised, or that are known to be linked (for example, the A and F versions, both with an eleventh-century Canterbury provenance, or version D, usually considered to have a Worcester provenance).

Chapter 1 ('Textualising the past') surveys the Interpolations made in the proto-E text in the first half of the twelfth century. It focuses on the way these Interpolations inscribe a geographical location within the text itself, and draws attention to their use of pre-existent textual context to articulate the identity of their centre of production. This is followed by a detailed consideration of the two Continuations made at Peterborough in Chapter 2 ('Continuing the *Chronicle*'). This chapter draws attention to the links and correspondences between the two Continuations, and the way in which they draw upon, and refer back to, the received proto-E version obtained by the abbey. A close textual analysis of the Peterborough text must necessarily be placed in the wider context of texts and scribes at Peterborough abbey and beyond, and Chapter 3 ('Making the *Chronicle*: form, genre, and identity') links together the external and internal dynamics of the construction of the *Peterborough Chronicle*. This chapter draws together a number of perspectives, starting with an immediate focus on the scribal activity at the abbey, and the historiographical links between Canterbury and Peterborough, but moving on to the much broader issue of the place of this *Chronicle* in the context of contemporary Latin historiography. In analysing the rationale for the text's construction, this study approaches the text from the perspective of genre theory, and draws attention to the paradoxical ability of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* in the twelfth century to use features associated with a traditional form and genre of historiography, and yet to push generic boundaries through the use and incorporation of alternative formats like charter and diplomatic. The limits of this generic mutation are instrumental in evaluating why the *Chronicle* at Peterborough eventually gave way to an alternative house-history in Latin, and this forms the subject of the concluding chapter. Chapter 4 revisits the immediate circumstances of the construction of the vernacular *Chronicle* at Peterborough, but now places it in the context of the construction of the Latin *Chronicle of Hugh Candidus* at the abbey in the latter part of the twelfth century. While acknowledging the material shared between the earlier vernacular *Chronicle* and the later Latin house-history, and the continuing relevance of certain prior concerns, this chapter also draws attention to the evolution of local interests and ideologies which necessitates the re-articulation of abbey history.

This book therefore argues for a paradigm shift in our critical

perception and understanding of how the various versions of the *Chronicle* developed and changed over time. A significant portion of *Chronicle* studies has focused on the writing of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* in the ninth and tenth centuries, but has paid far less attention to its continuation or use in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. It is only relatively recently (particularly through the *Chronicle* texts published as part of the collaborative edition) that the focus has shifted to the unique characteristics of a text (from a manuscript perspective), though critical scholarship from a textual and historical perspective has yet to catch up in this regard. This is perhaps because the critical perspective implicitly ranks the chronicling of contemporary events over the act of comparison or modification of pre-existent texts. What is perhaps not realised is that the act of maintaining annal entries contemporaneously, or active chronicling, is a myth, given that all *Chronicle* versions involve copying, recopying and emendations in their various stages. As noted earlier, in the case of the *Peterborough Chronicle*, it is only the First Continuation, a very small portion of the entire text, that can rightfully be viewed as contemporary chronicling. This study therefore argues that it is far more fruitful to see the *Peterborough* text, as well as other post-Conquest forms of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, as part of a wider textual culture, rather than as a remnant from the ninth century. Viewed from such a perspective, the transmission history of the various versions and the differences in their contents becomes a means to an end, rather than the be-all and end-all. Though this study does draw on scholarship regarding the transmission of the many *Chronicle* versions, it focuses more on the cultural status of the text, and the way in which it is perceived as an articulation of local and national identity. It demonstrates how the vernacular *Chronicle* does not exist in isolation, but participates actively in a post-Conquest historiographical culture. It also shows the extent to which a sustained interaction with Latin texts and other generic forms informs the construction of the *Peterborough Chronicle*.⁵⁹ In its analysis of the way this text participates in a complex twelfth-century literary culture involving Latin and vernacular text production, as well as its response to local influences, this study emphasises the need for more a sustained focus on the individuality of the various versions of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*.

⁵⁹ This will be analysed in greater detail in the following chapter, and in the overall consideration of generic boundaries in the *Chronicle* in Chapter 3, pp. 135–41.

Textualising the past

Maurice Halbwachs, in his study on collective memory and the sociology of knowledge, noted the indissoluble tie between the past and the present in the reconstruction of memory or past events. While 'the material traces, rites, texts, and traditions left behind by [the] past' form an essential part of secular, religious and institutional memory, they can only be reconstructed (and interpreted) 'with the aid ... of recent psychological and social data, that is to say, with the present'.¹ In many cases, the 'psychological and social data' of the present may be difficult to find in the textual content of medieval histories. One of the most famous of medieval historians, Henry of Huntingdon, was perhaps the most spare when it came to writing about the events of his own time.² For the medieval historian, the present was less a subject of discussion, and more of an interpretative tool. Contemporary events not only provided the impetus for the construction of texts; all events, past or present, were seen to be part of a grand scheme of things, which was given meaning through historiography.³ In his study of the network of historiographical endeavours that surrounded the construction and dissemination of the text of John of Worcester, Martin Brett notes the powerful impetus contemporary events gave to the articulation of monastic identity:

The justification for each house ... lay in their past. Their saints, their customs, their rights and their estates were the fruit of long growth in time. Violent political change and a new intellectual self-confidence threatened their tradition and forced it to become articulate in self-defence. A school of monastic historians was the result.⁴

Though Brett makes this observation in the context of Latin historiography in the twelfth century, it is equally applicable to the case of the *Peterborough Chronicle*, where both contemporary circumstances and

¹ Lewis A. Coser, ed., *Maurice Halbwachs: On Collective Memory* (Chicago, 1992), p. 119.

² Nancy Partner, *Serious Entertainments: The Writing of History in Twelfth-Century England* (Chicago, 1977), pp. 185–6.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 183–230.

⁴ M. Brett, 'John of Worcester and his Contemporaries', *The Writing of History in the Middle Ages. Essays presented to Richard William Southern*, ed. R. H. C. Davis et al. (Oxford, 1981), pp. 101–26, p. 126.

abbey tradition played a seminal role in the conception and construction of the text. The circumstances of the writing of the *Peterborough Chronicle* and the transformation of a generic *Chronicle* into a vehicle of local identity and ideology form the focus of this chapter.

Once the proto-E was transferred to Peterborough abbey, it was transmogrified into a totally new text. Unlike the modification of version A at Canterbury, the Peterborough scribe or compiler was not faced with a challenge of inserting text into a pre-existing manuscript, or physically changing the text to incorporate the new material.⁵ The *Peterborough Chronicle* was effectively a manuscript written from scratch, and its extant form shows it to be a fair copy rather than a work in progress.⁶ A significant aspect of its construction is the way in which the story of Peterborough abbey is woven into the narrative of national history that was already part of the proto-E text. This occurs in three discernible phases. The first phase is in the 1120s, when the interpolations are integrated into the received text of the proto-E, which seems to have already contained annals up to 1121. The second phase, which partly overlaps with the first phase, is the writing of the First Continuation. This was contemporary chronicling, and includes annals 1121 to 1131. The final phase occurs in the 1150s after a substantial hiatus, and involves the writing of annals 1132 to 1154.

All three stages of the Peterborough manuscript are testimony to the articulation of the abbey's identity over a period of time. However, the Peterborough Interpolations are the first to inscribe the *locus* of the text through the narrative of abbey origins. It is this influence of provenance on the narrative, and the imposition of a collective and communal identity on the proto-E, which forms the subject of the present chapter.

The articulation of identity: the Peterborough Interpolations

Annal 973 in the *Peterborough Chronicle* recounts the re-foundation of the abbey by Bishop Æthelwold, placing it in the context of the re-foundation of other monasteries in the Fenlands. The narrative notes how, in the course of building work on the foundations of the abbey (in ruins at the time, as a result of the ravages of the Danish army), old documents are discovered amongst the dilapidated walls.

⁵ The *Acta Lanfranci*, c. 1070 seems to have been written over erased annal numbers, see Bately, ed., *MS A*, pp. 83–9, and Dumville, 'Some Aspects', p. 42. For the modifications made by the F compiler in A, see Baker, ed., *MS F*, pp. ix–lxxxi. See also Introduction, pp. 11–16.

⁶ Compare with the state of the F manuscript in this regard, see David Dumville, ed., *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle 1. MS. F, Facsimile Edition* (Cambridge, 1995).

These documents claim to present, in written form, the story of the abbey and its origins, and the exceptional exemptions granted by its royal Anglo-Saxon patrons:

[F]and þa hidde in þa ealde wealle writes þet Headda abbot heafde ær gewriton: hu Wulfhere kyng 7 Æðelred his broðor hit heafden wroht, 7 hu hi hit freedon wið king 7 wið *biscop* 7 wið ealle weoruldþeudom, 7 hu se Papa Agatho hit feostnode mid his write 7 se *arcebiscop* Deusdedit.⁷

The collection of charters being referred to here is most likely to be the *Relatio Heddae*, a proto house-history of the abbey, and now extant as part of the *Liber Niger*, Peterborough's earliest cartulary. It is possible that this story of documents being found in the abbey walls is an invention, a legend made up to validate the existence of the *Relatio*. However, within the annal narrative, the implied presence of this pre-existing diplomatic is paramount, as it forms the basis of the grant of King Edgar, which claims to reconfirm the earlier rights enjoyed by the abbey, and also gives new land and privileges. But beyond the crystallisation of local legend, the narrative points towards far-reaching concerns affecting communal monastic identity, namely the importance of written documentation in articulating and validating monastic identity and monastic holdings.

Anxiety and the use of charters

The Norman Conquest marked a new political order and a territorial rearrangement, affecting the land-holdings of many owners, especially monastic communities. The poem on King William *s.a.* 1086 E hints at this changed post-Conquest landscape dominated by castle works and the demarcation of game preserves,⁸ and the *Domesday Book* may be considered both a symbol, and the textual outcome, of the Conqueror's preoccupation with landed property at his disposal.⁹ It is generally assumed that popular reaction to the Domesday survey cannot have been very different from the unknown chronicler's indignation recorded in the E text.¹⁰ A fear of property alienation is

⁷ 'Then they found hidden in the old walls documents that Abbot Hædda had written earlier, how King Wulfhere and his brother Æthelred had built it [i.e. the abbey], and how they had freed it from king and from bishop and from all secular services, and how the Pope Agatho had secured it with his charter, and the Archbishop Deusdedit as well.'

⁸ For example, 'Castelas he let wryrcan, / 7 earme men swiðe swencean' [ll.1–2] or 'He sætte mycel deorfrið' [ll. 12]. For the text of the poem see Irvine, ed., *MS E*, pp. 97–8. For a detailed analysis of the poem, see Home, "'These things we have written about him": the Portrait of King William in "The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle" 1086E', particularly pp. 241–50.

⁹ For the *Domesday Book* in translation, see Ann Williams and G. H. Martin, trans, *Domesday Book* (London, 2002).

¹⁰ See 1085 E: 'Swa swyðe nearwelice he hit lett ut aspyrian þet næs an ælpig hide ne an

seen in the post-Conquest inventories of land-holdings drawn up by monastic communities, which sometimes take pains to record not only the properties at their disposal, but also those which have already been alienated.¹¹

While there were radical changes in hierarchy, with many Saxon abbots and bishops being replaced by Norman ecclesiastics (some of whom were responsible for alienating monastic properties),¹² there were also cases where the Anglo-Saxon past of the monasteries was not considered invalid. Some Norman heads zealously promoted local Anglo-Saxon cults of the saints, sometimes acquiring more relics for the monastery concerned.¹³ Nevertheless, at this time of transition and political turbulence, the various monastic communities in England felt it necessary to re-evaluate their traditions and preserve their institutional memory of the past in the form of texts. Hemming, for example, was asked by Wulfstan II of Worcester to put together a narrative cartulary of the priory in order – amongst other things – to counter ‘the violence of the Normans ... who have unjustly deprived

gyrde landes, ne furðon – hit is sceame to tellanne, ac hit ne þuhte him nansceame to donne – an ox ne an cu ne an swin næs belyfon þet næs gesæt on his gewrite. 7 Ealle þa gewrita wæron gebroht to him syððan’ (So very narrowly he had it traced out that there was not a single hide nor a yard of land, further – it is shameful to tell but it did not seem any shame to him to do it – neither an ox nor a cow nor a pig was left out, that was not set down in his [written] record. And all the documents were brought to him afterwards). This is part of the *Chronicle* text that cannot be localised definitely, and belongs to the proto-E in its pre-Peterborough stage. However, the tone of this annal is similar to the prose section of 1086 E, and may well be written by the same annalist.

¹¹ J. A. Paxton, ‘Charter and Chronicle in Twelfth-Century England: The House Histories of the Fenland Abbeys’ (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1999), notes on pp. 141–4 that both the *Liber Eliensis* and the *Chronicon Abbatiae Rameseiensis* record the estates granted to them. The second part of the *Chronicon Abbatiae Rameseiensis* particularly mentions the initial grant along with the qualification that much of the property originally belonging to the monastery has been alienated. See W. D. Macray, ed., *Chronicon Abbatiae Rameseiensis*, RS 83 (London, 1886), pp. 46–70.

¹² See David Knowles, ‘Essays in Monastic History III – The Norman Monasticism’, *Downside Review* ns 31 (1932), 33–48, p. 35. Knowles notes that between 1066 and 1130, forty-one abbots from overseas were appointed to the Old English monastic houses, excluding the bishops of sees like Canterbury, Rochester and Norwich. As regards property alienation, *Hugh Candidus* notes, for example, that Abbot Turolf was responsible for alienating many Peterborough estates and giving them to his relations.

¹³ There seems to have been scepticism at initial stages. J. Campbell, ‘Some Twelfth-Century Views of the Anglo-Saxon Past’, in *Essays in Anglo-Saxon History* (London, 1986), pp. 209–28 notes that ‘Lanfranc conceived doubts about the sanctity of his predecessors Aelfheah and Dunstan; abbot Walter of Evesham submitted venerable relics of his house to verification by fire; abbot Warin expelled from the church at Malmesbury some of the relics of its saints’ (p. 210). However, the Evesham Chronicle also notes that when Abbot Walter ran out of money for the building of the new abbey church, he had to send out monks with the shrine and relics of St Egwin to raise money. *Hugh Candidus* notes that when Abbot Martin completed the chancel to the church he brought the holy relics into the church with great ceremony on St Peter’s day. The E text, s.a. 1013, and *Hugh Candidus* further note Abbot Ælfsige’s acquisition of the relics of St Florentine. For the importance of relic possessions for the historiography of Peterborough abbey, see Chapter 4, pp. 159–68.

this holy church'. Much later, the chronicle of Ramsey abbey was written to preserve relevant documents in the face of a disaster like the Anarchy of Stephen's reign.¹⁴ Sometimes contemporary disputes over the acquisition or loss of property, perhaps in the form of land, rights or relics, provided the stimulus, the monastic chroniclers being 'motivated by events in the present rather than the past'.¹⁵ However the process of writing these texts was neither all-inclusive nor arbitrary. It involved a careful process of 'neglect, selection, transformation and suppression', even the creation of new documents, which would convey the specific picture of the past that the monastery desired to present.¹⁶ Faced with the absence of documents regarding origins in the distant past, many foundation and confirmation charters were forged using material related to the foundation of other houses. The use of *topoi* was much favoured in this regard, and the circumstances of the founding of one monastery could easily be duplicated in a foundation charter of another monastery for which information about origins was scarce (if not non-existent), thus turning inference into actuality.¹⁷ Indeed, the twelfth century was the hey-day of forgery, and the process of constructing forged texts articulating monastic identity shared much in common across various institutions. These documents were then usually collected with other charters (forged or genuine) in a cartulary, or inserted in house-histories.¹⁸ Inserting charters, leases and diplomas within a narrative of house origins led to the development of the hybrid form of the 'chronicle-cartulary' in the twelfth century, texts increasingly preoccupied with identity and landed property.¹⁹ Sandra Raban notes in her survey of the estates of these abbeys that their pre-Conquest wealth made them particularly

¹⁴ See R. W. Southern, 'Aspects of the European Tradition of Historical Writing: 4, the Sense of the Past', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, series 5, 23 (1973), 243–63, and Campbell, 'Twelfth-Century Views', p. 209. Also see Paxton, 'Charter and Chronicle', pp. 185–6.

¹⁵ E. M. C. van Houts, *Local and Regional Chronicles*, *Typologie des Sources du Moyen Âge Occidental* 74 (Turnhout, 1995), pp. 29–30.

¹⁶ P. J. Geary, *Phantoms of Remembrance: Memory and Oblivion at the End of the Millenium* (Princeton, 1994), p. 83.

¹⁷ See Antonia Gransden, 'Traditionalism and Continuity during the Last Century of Anglo-Saxon Monasticism', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 40 (1989), 159–207. The 'foundation' charter of Christ Church, Canterbury forged in the second half of the eleventh century (J. M. Kemble, *Codex Diplomaticus Aevi Saxonici*, 6 vols (London, 1839–48), no. 715), for example, notes that the monks were dramatically expelled from the cathedral; this was probably emulating Edgar's expulsion of secular clerics at Winchester. As noted by Nicholas Brooks, *The Early History of the Church of Canterbury: Christ Church from 597 to 1066* (Leicester, 1984), pp. 255–7, the change from a secular community to a monastic one was gradual.

¹⁸ The *Liber Niger* of Peterborough or the chronicle-cartularies of Abingdon and Rochester, the house-histories of Peterborough, Ramsey, Ely, and later monasteries like Battle Abbey, all make use of extensive diplomatic documentation of this kind.

¹⁹ For a discussion of the importance of the legality of land grants in the twelfth-century *Hugh Candidus*, see Chapter 4, pp. 156–9.

vulnerable to the changes wrought by the Norman Conquest.²⁰ The Latin house-histories of three major Fenland abbeys – the *Chronicon Abbatiae Ramesiensis* from Ramsey (compiled during the middle of the reign of Henry II, probably around 1170), the *Liber Eliensis* from Ely (certainly written by the late twelfth century), and *Hugh Candidus* from Peterborough (also written in the second half of the twelfth century) – all demonstrate common preoccupations and obsessions, particularly with their landed property and other acquisitions like saints' relics or precious vestments.²¹

These texts, all constructed in the latter half of the twelfth century, make extensive use of archival texts in order to articulate their vision of the ideal monastic past, and use it as a means of coming to terms with the far-from-ideal present.²² The form of these house-histories, comprising both charter and narrative, has been placed in a transitional period of historiography where the narrative needs the support of a written charter, and the charter in turn needs the narrative commentary to put it in perspective. The use of forged diplomatic texts particularly needed some kind of a narrative framework.²³ As Searle aptly notes:

Forgery was perhaps usually a step in providing the house with charters required by royal and ecclesiastical courts. But although they must often have stated no more than the monastery's oral tradition, the opportunity to go further – too far – was very real. The danger that such forgeries constituted to the genuine tradition must have provided an incentive to collect the house's documents into a narrative history rather than a plain cartulary, for, out of context, 'doctored' charters could be very vulnerable. Where there was uncertainty or ambiguity, the best testimony as to a privilege or a possession was often the tale of

²⁰ 'Crowland and Thorney, like neighbouring Ramsey, Ely and Peterborough, were among the richest because they were established early and enjoyed the fruits of Anglo-Saxon patronage. It was in the pre-Conquest period that they achieved their enduring control over land in the east midlands. Never again was so much property to pass into the hands of the Church.' See Sandra Raban, *The Estates of Thorney and Crowland* (Cambridge, 1977), p. 88.

²¹ For the text of the *Liber Eliensis*, see E. O. Blake, ed., *Liber Eliensis*, Camden Third Series 79 (London, 1962), for translation, see Janet Fairweather, *Liber Eliensis: A History of the Isle of Ely from the Seventh Century to the Twelfth, compiled by a Monk of Ely in the Twelfth Century* (Woodbridge, 2005). For *Hugh Candidus*, see W. T. Mellows, ed., *The Chronicle of Hugh Candidus, a Monk of Peterborough*, and for the Ramsey chronicle, see Macray, ed., *Chronicon Abbatiae Ramesiensis*. It is possible that amongst these *Hugh Candidus* was the earliest compiled chronicle, probably written around 1155, certainly by 1175, see Chapter 4, pp. 147–8.

²² Take, for example, the case of Ely, where the *Liber Eliensis* was written from the viewpoint of the monks of the community, who were dissatisfied with the rule and property acquisitions of Bishop Nigel. For an assessment of Bishop Nigel's career by the Ely chronicler, see Blake, ed., *Liber Eliensis*, pp. 233–6.

²³ See Paxton, 'Charter and Chronicle', p. 217. This contextualisation was, as Brian Stock notes, only possible in a written culture making extensive use of texts, in an oral culture 'a forger was not a person who altered legal texts; he was a traitor'. See Brian Stock, *The Implications of Literacy* (Princeton, 1983), p. 60.

its donation and of its unwearied defence over the years, written and preserved in a desired version for the future.²⁴

This sustained use of charters (genuine or forged) along with associated archival material is a consistent feature of the chronicle-cartulary. However, it is less obviously a part of the vernacular *Chronicle* tradition, and although the E text in no way demonstrates the organised marshalling of textual resources (authentic or forged) which is the hallmark of some later cartulary-chronicles, it does incorporate a number of insertions relating to the founding of the abbey and its Anglo-Saxon past derived from charter material. Whatever the impetus – the fire of 1116, or a more general urge towards the marshalling of texts and resources – twelfth-century Peterborough witnessed a flurry of text construction in Latin and vernacular, and saw not just the compilation and construction of the E text, but also the production of the abbey's earliest cartulary (the *Liber Niger*) and the later house-history of *Hugh Candidus*. There is also a remarkable degree of overlap between all these texts: the charter narrative in the *Peterborough Chronicle* derives from documentation in the *Relatio Heddae* and the *Liber Niger*, much of which is also referred to in greater detail by *Hugh Candidus*.²⁵ It is also likely that the *Relatio* (in some form) pre-dated the construction of the E text, and, as the narrative in annal 973 of the *Peterborough Chronicle* indicates, a reference to the discovery of old documents may have been an act of validation for the *Relatio*.²⁶

The Interpolations incorporate material derived from charters, origin legends, abbey history, and notices of abbatial succession or demise. They are clear markers of the local affiliations of the text, though the diplomatic material is nowhere as comprehensive or detailed as the documents that form part of the *Relatio Heddae*, or the charters referred to in *Hugh Candidus*. It is unlikely that they were inserted into the vernacular text solely as a means of documentary validation, as the *Liber Niger* was probably taking shape around the same time. The reason for the insertion of the charters and associated origin history in the first stage of the compilation of the *Peterborough Chronicle* has never been analysed in detail, and is generally subsumed into the overarching question of why the text itself was written at this 'late' period. Critical attention has usually focussed on

²⁴ E. Searle, ed., *The Chronicle of Battle Abbey*, OMT (Oxford, 1980), p. 5. *Hugh Candidus* significantly omits a detailed narrative of those lands which are recorded as part of the origin charters, perhaps a tacit admission of their ambiguity and 'doctored' nature, see Chapter 4, pp. 156–7.

²⁵ For an analysis of the way in which the vernacular and Latin texts at Peterborough approach this material, see Chapter 4, pp. 150–9.

²⁶ Paxton, 'Forging Communities', pp. 95–109.

the writing of the Latin histories, and Martin Brett's seminal study has drawn attention to the network of scholarship that surrounds the text produced by John of Worcester. Brett notes the chroniclers' awareness of the validity of their profession as historians, which he compares to the dissemination of *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* in an earlier period.²⁷ On the other hand, the compilation and continuation of the E text have been represented as an 'English' point of view in post-Conquest literary culture, separate from a 'Norman' one. In her magisterial survey of historiography in medieval England, Gransden talks about the demise of the *Chronicle* tradition in precisely such terms:

[T]he Conquest killed the Chronicle, mainly because English was no longer the language of the ruling class (the Peterborough version survived the longest presumably because it was written in an area which became a centre of English resistance).²⁸

While a linguistic shift may affect literary production, such presumptions about the survival of the E text are best avoided. The construction of the *Peterborough Chronicle* amidst hectic textual activity and the compilation of the F version at Canterbury are proof that the *Chronicle* tradition, though mutated, was far from dead. Further, in the case of the E text, it is the interpolated material itself which renders this statement untenable. Gransden makes reference to the 'English resistance' of 1070, a turning point for the Fenland abbeys, when Hereward and his companions rebelled against the imposition of a Norman abbot at Peterborough. This event is recorded differently in the traditions of Peterborough and Ely, and is narrated as part of the interpolated annal 1070 in the *Peterborough Chronicle*.²⁹ The immediate consequence of this rebellion was financial: both Ely and Peterborough faced the imposition of heavy knight service. However, as the Peterborough narrative makes clear, not only did the monks of Peterborough seem to prefer the rule of the Norman abbot, Turolf, to Hereward's revolt,³⁰ but there is never any clear demarcation between separate 'Anglo-Saxon' and 'Norman' camps.³¹

These interpolations made in the first stage of the text's compilation therefore need to be analysed on their own terms. They are an important part of the *Chronicle* at Peterborough, and should be assessed in a textual and ideological context that is local as well as

²⁷ Brett, 'John of Worcester and his Contemporaries', pp. 101–26, especially p. 125.

²⁸ A. Gransden, *Historical Writing in England c. 550 to c. 1307* (London, 1974), p. 92. For a survey of 'Englishness' as articulated in the *Chronicle* versions, see the study by Pauline Stafford, 'The Anglo-Saxon Chronicles, Identity and the Making of England', *Haskins Society Journal* 19 (2008), 28–50.

²⁹ The raid of Hereward is discussed in greater detail later, see below, pp. 44–9.

³⁰ See Irvine, ed., *MS E*, pp. 88–89. Also see Mellows, ed., *Hugh Candidus*, pp. 77–80.

³¹ See Clark, ed., *The Peterborough Chronicle*, p. xxxiii.

national. In this study, for structural clarity, the interpolated annals have been divided into two broad sections – diplomatic (those derived from charter material) and non-diplomatic – though distinctions are never watertight and absolute. It considers the Interpolations not as later embellishments for a text belonging to a tradition of vernacular historiography, but as a coherent articulation of local identity.

Identity, origins and the interpolated charters

The first mention of the history of Peterborough Abbey occurs *s.a.* 654, which notes King Peada's desire to build the monastery of *Medeshamstede* (as Peterborough was then known), therefore placing the story of Peterborough's origins before the foundation of its rival, Ely.³² The placing of this insertion is particularly apt, as this is noted in the *Chronicle* as a period when Christianity was gradually crystallising into an official (and royal) religion in England. The numerous references to conversions and church-building are part of the 'Common Stock', and belong to the broad framework of national and ecclesiastical history ultimately derived from Bede.³³ The placing of the annal demonstrates the compiler's sense of context, though later composition is hinted at by the use of the past tense in speaking of the abbot, Seaxwulf.³⁴ The annal's single-minded focus on Seaxwulf and the monastery which he founds is notable. Any other accretions to this story (for example, the murder of King Peada by his wife at Easter) are not elaborated upon.³⁵ This brief interpolation is, in a way, representative of the others, demonstrating a focus on the history and affairs of the abbey, combined with subtle rhetorical strategies of narrative progression.

³² Kelly, ed., *Charters of Peterborough Abbey*, pp. 6–7.

³³ A number of annals may be chosen to serve as examples. A random sample follows:
639: '[Ercenbriht] towearp ealla þa deofelgyld on his rice, 7 ærost Englisca cininga he gesette Eastorfeasten' ([Ercenbriht] cast away the idolatry in his kingdom and [was] the first of the English kings to set the observance of Easter).

641: 'And her Cenwalh feng to Wæstseaxena rice 7 heold .xxi. wintra; se Cenwalh het atimbrian þa cyrican on Wintanceastre' (And here Cenwalh succeeded to the kingdom of the West Saxons and held it twenty-one winters. The same Cenwalh commanded a church to be built at Winchester).

653: 'Botwulf ongan timbrian mynster æt Icanhoe' (Botwulf began to build a monastery at Icanhoe).

³⁴ 'He wæs swyðe Godes freond, 7 him luuede al þeode, 7 he wæs swyðe æpelboren on weorulde 7 rice; h[e] is nu mycelne riccere mid Criste' (He was a great friend of God and all the people loved him, he was distinguished in this world and kingdom; he is now much richer with Christ). The use of the neuter in 'betahten hit þa an munec ...' (then [they] entrusted it to a monk) is also a sure sign of later writing. See Irvine, ed., *MS E*, p. 26.

³⁵ Not so in the case of the later narrative of *Hugh Candidus*, where it is set in the context of the original betrayal of man by the woman tempted by the Devil, see Mellows, ed., *Hugh Candidus*, pp. 7–8.

One of the most striking features of the Interpolations is their length, and this is all the more apparent in the insertions made in the 'Common Stock' portion of the proto-E. They do not conform to the notions of brevity traditionally associated with the annal format, and make varied use of language to create a comparatively structured narrative. The grant of Wulfhere *s.a.* 656 textually renders the complex and extended process of building a religious foundation as a single annal entry. Ideas of time are used as narrative devices, and general and particular modes of temporal reference coexist. The annal notes that Abbot Seaxwulf needed 'feuna geare' (few years) to build a monastery, without noting how many years it took.³⁶ The narrative notes, almost immediately, that the monastery was consecrated on a particular day.³⁷ This date of consecration was likely to be mentioned in a charter or writ as the date of foundation rather than the date when the first grant was made,³⁸ and is also indicated by the annal number under which the interpolation is made.

While it is not unusual for the rigidity of the annal format to be relaxed to accommodate events of more than a year, the grant of Wulfhere attempts to encapsulate, within the scope of a single annal entry, the complex process of monastic foundation.³⁹ While the traditional annal format is not discarded, rhetoric is used to gloss over the lack of temporal specification. This annal is striking in its sense of dramatic immediacy. Parallel clauses and *polysyndeton* in the narrative provide coherence, and a sense of causality and progression.⁴⁰ This

³⁶ 'Swa he spedde swa him Christ huðe, swa þet in feuna geare wæs þet mynstre gare' (So he was successful as Christ granted him, so that in few years that monastery was ready).

³⁷ The king says: 'Ðancod wurð hit þon hæge ælmihti God þis wurðscipe þet her is gedon, 7 ic wile wurðigen þis dæi Crist 7 Sancte Peter...' (Thanks be it to the high Almighty God for this honour that is done here; and I will honour on this day Christ and Saint Peter).

³⁸ See V. H. Galbraith, 'Monastic Foundation Charters of the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries', *The Cambridge Historical Journal* 4 (1934), 205–22, p. 214. This convention was followed simply because the making of grants towards monastic foundations may have extended over a substantial period of time.

³⁹ Earlier entries in the 'base' text for example, refer to regnal periods or events happening some years later:

616: '7 þes þa ymb .v. wintra rixiendum Eadbaldum Mellitus for to Criste. Þa æfter feng to þam ercebiscop dome Iustus, 7 he halgode to Hrofeceastre Romanum þær he ær wæs biscop.' (And during these five winters [in the] reign [of] Eadbald, Mellitus went to Christ. After that Justus succeeded to [the position of] archbishop. And he consecrated Romanus to Rochester where he had been bishop).

643: 'Her forðferde Paulinus ærcebishop on Rofeceastre .vi. idus Octobris; se wæs bishop an læs .xx. wintra. 7 .ii. monðas 7 .xxi. daga. And her feng Oswine(s) <Edwines> fedran suna sunu Osrices to Dearne rice 7 rixade .vii. winter.' (In this year Paulinus, archbishop of Rochester died on October 10. He had been bishop nineteen years and two months and twenty-one days. And here Oswine, son of Osric [who was] Edwin's cousin on his father's [side], succeeded to the throne of Deira and reigned seven winters). The narrative of Cynewulf and Cyneheard *s.a.* 755 contains events belonging to later years; the actual death of Cynewulf is recorded in annal 784 [786].

⁴⁰ Consider, for example, the following extract which describes the process of building *Medeshamstede* from inception to consecration. Emphases mine.

mode of narration effectively glosses over the significant lapse of time between the construction of the monastery and the day of its actual consecration. The phrase ‘feuna geara’ is lost in the causal connectivity implied by the parallel clauses. The use of parallel clauses in itself is not a new narrative device in the *Chronicle*: frequent instances may be found in earlier as well as later annals.⁴¹ But in the Interpolations, parallel

‘**Ða** feorde se abbot ham 7 ongan to wircene. **Swa** he spedde **swa** him Crist huðe, **swa** þæt in feuna geara wæs þæt mynstre gare. **Ða** þa kying heorda þæt gesecgon, **þa** wærð he swiðe glæd; heot seonden geond al hi<S> þeode **æfter** alle his þægne, **æfter** ærcebiscop 7 **æfter** biscopas, 7 **æfter** his eorles 7 **æfter** alle þa þe Gode luuedon, þæt hi scoldon to him cumene; 7 seotte þa dæi hwonne man scolde þæt mynstre gehalgodon. **Ða** man halgode seo mynstre, **þa** wæs seo kying Wulfere þær 7 his broðer Æðelred 7 his swustre Kyneburg 7 Kynesuith; 7 seo mynstre halgode seo ærcebiscop Deusdedit of Cantwarbyrig 7 seo biscop of Rofecæstre Ithamar, 7 seo biscop of Lundone þe wæs Wina gehaten 7 seo Myrcene biscop Ieruman wæs gehaten 7 Tuda biscop, 7 þær wæs Wilfrid preost þe siððon wæs biscop, 7 þær wæron alle his ðegnas þe wæron on his kynerice. **Ða** seo mynstre wæs gehalgod on Sancte Petres nama 7 Sancte Paules 7 Sancte Andreas, **þa** stod seo kying up toforen ealle his ðægna, cwæ[ð] luddor stefne.’ (Then the abbot journeyed home and began to work. Thus he prospered as Christ granted him, so that in few years that monastery was ready. When the king heard that reported, then he was very happy, he ordered to send around all his kingdom after all his thanes, after the archbishops and after the bishops and after his earls, and after all those who loved God, that they should come to him; and set the day when the monastery would be consecrated. When the monastery was consecrated, then the king Wulfhere was there and his brother Æthelred and his sisters Cyneburh and Cyneswith; and the archbishop Deusdedit of Canterbury consecrated the monastery and Ithamar, bishop of Rochester, and the bishop of London who was called Wina, and the bishop of the Mercians who was called Jaruman, and Bishop Tuda, and there was the priest Wilfrid who was afterwards bishop, and there were all his thanes who were in his kingdom. When the monastery was consecrated in the name of Saint Peter and Saint Paul and Saint Andrew, then the king stood up before all his thanes and said in a sonorous voice ...).

⁴¹ Annal 871, for example, which notes the progress of the ‘raiding army’ over a period of time, uses parallel clauses as additives progressing from one instance to the other rather than as an instrument of causality. Various encounters are noted as happening in different locations in similar language and phraseology, but one event is not necessarily the direct cause of the next encounter. Emphases mine.

‘Her rad se here to Readingum on Westseaxe, 7 þes ymb .iii. niht ridon twegen eorlas up; þa gemette Æðelwulf ealdorman hie on Englafelda 7 heom þær wið gefeagt 7 sige nam, 7 wearð þær se oper ofslægen þæs nama wæs Sidrac. Ða ymb .iiii. niht Æðelred cining 7 Ælfred his broðor þær micle fyrd to Rædingum gelæddon 7 wið þone here gefuhton, 7 þær wæs mycel wæl geslægen on gehwaðere hand, 7 Æðelwulf ealdorman wearð ofslægen, 7 þa Deniscan ahton wælstowe gewæld. And ymb .iiii. niht gefeagt Æðered cining 7 Ælfred his broðor wið ealne ðone here on Æscesdune ... 7 ða feaht se cining Æðered wið ðara cininga getruman ... 7 ðæs ymb .xiiii. niht gefeagt Æðered cining 7 Ælfred his broðor wið þone here æt Basingum, 7 þær þa Deniscan sige genamon. 7 þæs ymb twegen monðas gefeagt Æðered cining 7 Ælfred his broðor wið þone here æt Mæredune ...’ (Here the [Viking] raiding army rode to Reading in Wessex and three days after two earls/jarls rode up [country]; then ealdorman Æthelwulf met them at Englefield and there fought against them and took victory, and there was slain one of them whose name was Sidroc. Then after four days, King Æthelred and Alfred his brother led a great army to Reading and fought against the raiding army, and there was great slaughter done on either side, and ealdorman Æthelwulf was slain, and the Danes possessed the place of slaughter. And after four days King Æthelred and Alfred his brother fought against the entire raiding army at Ashdown ... and then King Æthelred fought against the king’s force ... And fourteen days after that King Æthelred and Alfred his brother fought against the raiding army at Basing and there the Danes took victory.

clauses are a consistent mode of narrative progression, increasing the pace of the narrative by implying causal connectivity. This simple yet effective device is extensively used in the non-diplomatic interpolations and in the later Peterborough narratives with similar consistency.

Comparing *Chronicle* versions, it seems highly likely that the original 'Common Stock' entry for 657 may have merely recorded Wulfhere's succession to the throne of Mercia.⁴² The E text's narrative of origins centres the text physically and geographically at Peterborough. Unlike near-contemporary house-histories like the later *Hugh Candidus*, or the *Liber Eliensis*, the *Peterborough Chronicle* does not contain a topographical preface or description of Peterborough/Medeshamstede, merely noting that the place took on the name of *Medeshamstede* because of a nearby well (*Medeswæl*).⁴³ However, its narrative of the foundation of the abbey emphasises the *locus* of the text, and through its imagery of building and construction in annal 656, embeds this geographical space in the text itself. This creation of a geographical space which is simultaneously real (in terms of the text's provenance) and symbolic (in terms of the idealised place created through the narrative) remains an abiding concern.

The story of the origins of *Medeshamstede* is obviously part of the abbey's tradition, with the charter of Wulfhere being an important document in the construction of Peterborough's Anglo-Saxon origins. This is evidenced by the existence of this charter in every extant Peterborough cartulary, as well as by the existence of an expanded and highly decorated thirteenth/fourteenth-century version of this document. This story of origins is also present in *Hugh Candidus*, and both vernacular and Latin texts doubtless made use of common source material from the *Relatio Heddae* and the *Liber Niger*.⁴⁴ The *Relatio* may be regarded as the earliest attempt at house-history that Peterborough produced,⁴⁵ a putative predecessor to the later house-history of *Hugh*

And two months after this King Æthelred and Alfred his brother fought against the raiding army at Merton ...).

⁴² The A text of the *Chronicle*, for example, merely notes *s.a.* 657, 'Her forpferde Peada, 7 Wulfhere Pending feng to Miercna rice' (Here Penda died and Wulfhere, the son of Penda, succeeded to the kingdom of Mercia).

⁴³ See Annal 654 in Irvine, ed., *MS E*, p. 26.

⁴⁴ See Clarke, ed., *The Peterborough Chronicle*, p. xxviii: '[D]ependence of both on local oral tradition is not enough to explain the almost verbal correspondences between the two works. Clearly, the "ancient writings" Hugo mentions were a genuine source, not just a figure of speech; but what they consisted of remains partly conjectural. Certainly there were abbey deeds, both genuine and spurious available to both of them' (*Hugh Candidus* is referred to as 'Hugo'). For *Hugh Candidus*, see Chapter 4, pp. 149–68.

⁴⁵ The abbot Hedda who presumably wrote the *Relatio* is generally supposed to be the abbot of the same name at *Medeshamstede* in the second half of the ninth century, and this may have been a tradition fixed by *Hugh Candidus* after the *Relatio* was written, see Mellows, ed., *Hugh Candidus*, pp. 22–3, 'Successit uero Cuthbaldo in sepedicti monasterii regimine Egbaldu; illique Pusa; [Benna] eidemque Celeredus; ipsi quoque Hedda' (There succeeded Cuthbald in the government of the aforesaid monastery Egbaldu, after

Candidus, and the 'first step in altering Peterborough's historical profile in order to give it a royal Anglo-Saxon pedigree, which it otherwise lacked'.⁴⁶ Paxton contends that it existed in some form before 1121, perhaps even with its narrative introduction.⁴⁷ In whatever form the *Relatio* may have existed for the compiler of E to make use of, it is significant that the manner in which the charters are inserted in E is substantially different. Also significant is the element of choice, as not all privileges contained in the *Relatio* are present in the *Peterborough Chronicle*.

Though the grant of Wulfhere is itself spurious,⁴⁸ its presence in a range of Peterborough texts in the twelfth century is, in itself, indicative of the way this charter is used as an articulation of identity. Large portions of the Latin version are incorporated verbatim from the *Relatio* in *Hugh Candidus*, and in the version of this text in Whittlesey's cartulary there is a clear reference made to a written document used to validate the bounds. However, while Hugh amplifies the narrative with more detail, the E text summarises the exemptions, reproduces conventional charter formulae in translation, but includes the bounds

him Pusa, then Ceolred, and after him Hedda). It is possible that the name refers to an earlier abbot at Breedon and perhaps at *Medeshamstede* as well, who probably succeeded Seaxwulf as bishop, see Simon Keynes, *The Councils of Clofesho*, Vaughan Paper 38 (Leicester, 1994), p. 41, note 177, and Kelly, ed., *Charters of Peterborough Abbey*, pp. 71–5.

⁴⁶ Paxton, 'Forging Communities', p. 99. Also see Kelly, ed., *Charters of Peterborough Abbey*, pp. 86–8.

⁴⁷ For the narrative prologue to the charters in the *Relatio*, see Kelly, ed., *Charters of Peterborough Abbey*, Appendix I, pp. 359–60. Paxton also discerns a similarity of phrasing between the Latin reference to Seaxwulf, 'uir prepotens et seculo et religione regisque et ecclesie acceptissimus' and the Old English *s.a.* 654, 'He wæs swyðe Godes freond, 7 him luuede al þeode, 7 he wæs swyðe æþelboren on weorulde 7 rice; h[e] is nu mycelne riccere mid Criste'. In my opinion, however, the logic is perhaps too slim, and even Paxton admits the difference in emphasis in the formulation. What is more important is the fact that the scribe had access to the Latin documents in the *Relatio*, and that texts containing similar documents were being compiled in an alternative language, Latin, around the time the vernacular E text was being written.

⁴⁸ See P. H. Sawyer, ed., *Anglo-Saxon Charters: an Annotated List and Bibliography*, Royal Historical Society Guides and Handbooks 8 (London, 1968), S 68, in particular the comments on p. 88. The version in the *Relatio* is printed in Kelly, ed., *Charters of Peterborough Abbey*, pp. 131–44. Most early Anglo-Saxon royal grants usually contained a clause excepting military service and the repair of bridges and fortresses from the exemption from secular services – see W. H. Stevenson, 'Trinoda Necessitas', *EHR* 29 (1914), 689–703. This custom is thought to have originated in Mercia in the mid eighth century (therefore technically after the reign of Wulfhere) and the phrase only occurs in a spurious charter attributed to Cædwalla. There are also other discrepancies and marks of the spurious nature of this grant. 'Eorl', for instance, is used anachronistically ('Ic, Wulfhere kyning, mid þas kyningas 7 mid eorles ...' (I, King Wulfhere, with these kings and these earls...)); the text refers to Wulfhere's two brothers, Æthelred and Merewala, but the latter disappears in the course of the narrative (*Hugh Candidus* mentions only one brother who is later named as Æthelred); Kings Sigehere and Sebbi, who are not mentioned in the narrative, appear as witnesses in the charter. There is also the reference to the monastery being consecrated to St Peter, St Paul and St Andrew. Subsequently, only St Peter is mentioned as patron saint of *Medeshamstede*.

almost verbatim within the annal narrative itself. This accurate reproduction of the bounds of a charter (albeit spurious) gives the impression that the narrative is creating a geographical space that can be mapped locally, and its boundaries retraced by following the pointers given in the text.⁴⁹ At the same time, the very spuriousness of the charter (even though it may well have been based on some kind of genuine documentation) renders this geographical landscape symbolic rather than real.⁵⁰ The bounds not only create a symbolic space which acts as the *locus* of the text, but, in a striking narrative adaptation of the contents of the charter, they are structured as a royal speech act, condensing the narrative and imbuing it with dramatic immediacy. So the charter bounds represent the property granted to *Medeshamstede* as a royal act, and Wulfhere also states the exemptions as part of the speech at the moment of consecration:

Hit is lytel, þeos gife, ac ic wille þet hi hit hælden swa kynlice 7 swa freolice þet þær ne be numen of na geld ne gaule buton to þa munecan ane. Ðus ic wille freon þis minstre þet hit ne be underþed buton Rome ane, 7 hider ic wille þet we secan Sancte Petre, ealle þa þa to Rome na magen faren.⁵¹

It is possible that the compiler may have had ample warrant for this use of the first person from the original form of the charter, which is structured as a diploma rather than as a letter. While the form of a letter described the act of granting in the past tense, the diploma attempted to recreate the actual moment of the grant. In the post-Conquest period, a charter written in the form of a letter would have been the norm, and the diploma was merely symbolic, since the grant was technically complete without it.⁵² Nevertheless, it was used because it claimed to perpetuate the actual moment of the grant in

⁴⁹ See Nicolas Howe, *Writing the Map of Anglo-Saxon England: Essays in Cultural Geography* (New Haven, 2008), 33–4. In speaking of the charter as a historical document Howe comments that ‘The knowledge of the place here is at once local, because it is limited to those who know the property from personal experience, and immediate, because it could not be re-created or retraced from someone outside the community in future years.’ However, because the charter is embedded in a *Chronicle* text belonging to an established tradition of historiography, the boundaries of this geographical space are also implied to be immutable and eternal.

⁵⁰ See *ibid.*, p. 36, ‘The sense of the past displayed by charters and especially their boundary clauses is that of the locality itself – so much so that ... charters containing more encompassing historical material from Bede or the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* are suspect as later forgeries.’

⁵¹ ‘It is little, this gift; but I desire that they hold it so royally and so freely that from there be not taken either of tribute or rent except for the monks only. I will thus free this monastery that it will not be subordinate to any except to Rome only. And I desire that we seek Saint Peter here, all those who may not journey to Rome.’

⁵² Galbraith, ‘Monastic Foundation Charters’, pp. 210–11.

all its solemnity; its origins could be traced back to the Anglo-Saxon *landboc*. To date the diploma was 'to date the act and vice versa'.⁵³

This is why the diploma form was used for the foundation charters of monasteries, and the formality, solemnity and tradition associated with this form would have led to forgeries being conceived in a similar vein. The implications of the use of the first person in the forged charter, and the authority associated with it, must have been apparent to the compiler of the E text. It is indeed significant that the annal narrative lays great emphasis on the speech act itself.⁵⁴ The written word (as derived and translated from the diplomatic) is converted into oral speech as the king interacts through dialogue with the other characters – the most common verb of granting is 'cwæð'. The witnesses further validate the king's word by verbally enunciating and then inscribing with the sign of the cross.⁵⁵ The act of inscription is paramount, for not only does the phrase 'gewriten mid here fingre' occur repeatedly as a formula in this annal, but the sign of the cross is actually inscribed into the manuscript itself by the scribe.⁵⁶ It is significant here that the charter as it stands in the manuscript of the *Relatio* does not contain the mark made by the witnesses, even though earlier editors like Birch have neaten things up by including the crosses in their editions.⁵⁷ We do not know the reason for this omission in the *Relatio*, but it serves to highlight the Peterborough compiler's awareness of the form of a charter or diploma, and the sources of its authenticity and validity.

By constructing the event as a moment in time where the king verbally enunciates his gift, authority becomes associated with the

⁵³ As Galbraith further notes in his survey of foundation charters, '[I]t is significant that the crosses of surviving witnesses, though said to be made by their own hands, were in fact almost invariably made by the scribe. Not only does this suggest that the act was complete without the document but it shows that the *landboc* was something unusual, exceptional, which would not be lightly called in question.' *Ibid.*, pp. 209–10.

⁵⁴ The charter is rewritten as a historical event, thus making effective use of the strategy known in Classical rhetoric as *enargia*, see R. A. Lanham, *A Handlist of Rhetorical Terms* (Berkeley, 1969), p. 40.

⁵⁵ 'Ðas sindon þa wites þe þær wæron 7 þa þet gewriten mid here fingre on Cristes mele 7 ietten mid here tunge. Ðet wæs f\i/rst seo kyning Wulfhere þe þet feostnode first mid his worde 7 siððon mid his fingre gewrat on Cristes mel 7 þus cwæð...' (These were the witnesses who were there and those who wrote it with their finger on Christ's sign and agreed with their tongues. That was first the king Wulfhere who confirmed [it] first with his word and then with his finger wrote [on] the sign of the cross, and thus said ...), see Irvine, ed., *MS E*, pp. 28–9.

⁵⁶ Swanton, *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicles*, p. 31 n. 14. See also Whitelock, *Peterborough Chronicle*, pp. 28–32, containing the grant of Wulfhere, fols 14v–16v; this should be compared with London, Society of Antiquaries, MS 60, fols 59v–64r, containing the Latin version in the *Relatio*.

⁵⁷ This practice of including scribal crosses has not however been followed in the recent edition, see Kelly, ed., *Charters of Peterborough Abbey*, pp. 131–4.

spoken word, which is then ratified through the act of inscription. In this, the Peterborough interpolator shows a degree of literary skill as well as propriety. He is aware of the historiographical tradition of the *Chronicle*, and refrains from the verbatim incorporation of diplomatic more suited to a cartulary. At the same time he is certainly aware of the rhetorical effect that a grant in diploma form has, and the importance of it being available as a written text, and constructs his narrative accordingly to emphasise this. The use of the speech act as a subtle rhetorical instrument of validation in the E text may be contrasted with the overt method of the original charter, where the authority of the titular patron is evoked in order to justify a spurious privilege. The charter in the *Relatio* exempts *Medeshamstede* and its dependent churches from all royal dues by quoting Christ's question to St Peter,

'Reges gencium' ait Dominus Petro 'a quibus accipiunt tributa, a filiis an ab alienis?' 'Ab alienis' inquit Petrus. 'Ergo liberi sunt filii' dicit dominus.⁵⁸

The privileges given by Wulfhere's grant are ratified and increased by the Bull of Pope Agatho, *s.a.* 675. This papal bull notably includes a provision excluding the monastery from the jurisdiction of its diocesan bishop.⁵⁹ At the time when the privilege was supposedly granted, the diocesan bishop would have been Seaxwulf, the founder of the abbey. The fact that the founder of the monastery would have no power over it as diocesan bishop serves to emphasise the absolute nature of the privilege granted.⁶⁰ It is also possible that this forgery drew its claim to legitimacy from historical and literary precedents, and echoes another famous privilege of exemption granted by Pope Agatho to another famous and ancient monastery. In his *Lives of the Abbots of Wearmouth and Jarrow*, Bede mentions that Benedict Biscop obtained a privilege for Wearmouth from Pope Agatho, which was later confirmed by Pope Sergius at the request of his successor Ceolfrid. However, the privilege obtained by Benedict Biscop for the

⁵⁸ 'The Lord said to Peter, "From whom do the kings of the country accept tribute, from sons or from foreigners?" "From foreigners", answered Peter. "Therefore these sons are free", said the Lord.' See Kelly, ed., *Charters of Peterborough Abbey*, pp. 131–44, for the text of the charter.

⁵⁹ David Knowles, 'Essays in Monastic History IV – The Growth of Exemption', *Downside Review* ns 31 (1932), 201–31 and 396–436. Knowles notes at p. 202 that, theoretically, autonomous monasteries (like Peterborough) were not exempt from the bishop's jurisdiction, but actual circumstance may sometimes lead them to function in a manner independent of the bishop's intervention.

⁶⁰ This fact is emphasised by both the E text and *Hugh Candidus*. Seaxwulf's subscription occurs in no uncertain terms: 'Ic Seaxwulf **þe wæs first abbot 7 nu eam biscop** ic gife hi min curs 7 ealle min æftergengle þe þis tobreket.' (I, Saxwulf, **who first was abbot and now am bishop**, I give those who violate this, my curse and all my successors' [curses].) Emphases mine. Also see Irvine, ed., *MS E*, p. 32.

monastery with the consent of King Egfrid 'rendered [the monastery] wholly safe and secure continually from assault from without'.⁶¹ In contrast to the general term *extrinsica irruptione*, the Peterborough text is specific about the external interventions that may occur, especially with regard to the authority of the diocesan bishop.⁶² While Benedict Biscop's charter did not in any way exempt the monastery totally from the authority of the diocesan bishop,⁶³ the specificity of the Peterborough charter may be a measure of local ideologies and politics.⁶⁴ Like the earlier grant of Wulfhere, this annal continues its emphasis on the dual acts of speech and writing. King Æthelred conveys information ('cydde him') to the pope 'mid writ 7 mid worde', and when the pope grants his *gewrit* 'charter', the operative participle is *cweðende* 'saying/speaking', emphasising that a combination of the two modes is a source of authority.⁶⁵

The next stage in the abbey's story is the restoration of *Medeshamstede* by Bishop Æthelwold, *s.a.* 963. This event is elaborately related in *Hugh Candidus*, which details how Æthelwold translated his visions into actuality with the queen's help.⁶⁶ The E text does not focus on the miraculous, but on the actual background of the re-foundation – the consecration of Æthelwold and his founding of many monasteries,

⁶¹ 'ab omni prorsus extrinsica irruptione tutum perpetuo redderetur ac liberum'. See J. E. King, ed., *Bedæ Opera Historica*, 2 vols (London, 1930), II, p. 404.

⁶² 'Ic beode æc þæt þe scyrbiscop ne seo swa dyrstlece þæt he ne hading ne halging ne do on þis abbotrice, buton seo abbot hit him bidde; ne biscopwite ne sinað ne nanes kinnes þing na haue þær nan onsting' (I command also that the bishop of the shire be not so presumptuous that he perform either ordination or hallowing within this abbacy, except that the abbot command him to do it; neither bishop's fine nor synod nor any assembly of any kind have any authority there). See Irvine, ed., *MS E*, p. 31.

⁶³ On his deathbed, Benedict gives the following instructions to the brethren (King, ed., *Bedæ Opera Historica*, II, pp. 418–19):

'Sed iuxta quod regula magni quondam abbatis Benedicti, iuxta quod privilegii nostri continet decreta, in conventu vestrae congregationis communi consilio perquiratis, qui secundum vitae meritum et sapientiae doctrinam aptior ad tale ministerium perficiendum digniorque probetur, et quemcunque omnes unanime charitatis inquisitione optimum cognoscentes elegeritis; hunc vobis accito episcopo rogetis abbatem consueta benedictione firmari' (But in accordance with the rule of our sometime abbot, the great Benedict, and in accordance with the decrees of our letter of privilege, look ye out with common consent in the assembly of your congregation the man which, by reason of his good life and wise doctrine, shall be shown better fitted and more worthy than others for the fulfilment of such a ministry, and whomsoever ye shall all with one accord upon loving enquiry judge and choose to be the best: then summon the bishop, and require him to confirm this man with the accustomed blessing to be your abbot).

⁶⁴ In a highly suspect clause, the abbot of Peterborough remains subject to the authority of the archbishop of Canterbury. For a detailed analysis of the textual relations between Peterborough and Canterbury, see Chapter 3, pp. 111–20.

⁶⁵ Indeed, the incidence of words and phrases relating to documentation, 'gewrite', 'festnie mid Cristes tacne', or 'write', is more prevalent in this annal, with the words 'writ' and 'gewrit' occurring six and three times respectively in the course of this entry alone.

⁶⁶ See Mellows, ed., *Hugh Candidus*, pp. 27–38.

replacing secular orders with monastic orders.⁶⁷ As scholarship has shown, the change from secular communities to monastic ones was never total and radical, but in most cases gradual and conciliatory.⁶⁸ Nevertheless, the radical expelling of the secular clerks from Old and New Minster formed the model of most accounts of the monastic reform.⁶⁹ Æthelwold's foundation of New Minster and Nunnaminster, and the restoration of Ely, form the background of the re-foundation of *Medeshamstede*. The narrative then continues as the grant of King Edgar.

King Edgar's charter reconfirms the absolute and anachronistic privileges granted by the earlier charters, and adds more property to the estates already enjoyed by *Medeshamstede*, reaffirming, yet changing, the geographical landscape implied by the grant of Wulfhere. This symbolic and physical aggrandisement of space and power is, however, part of a fallacy. The earlier charters of Wulfhere and Agatho had claimed to guarantee all grants, those made through the charters and those that may be made in the future, in perpetuity. However, this exaggerated claim is somewhat invalidated by Edgar's charter of reconfirmation, which only proves that the 'absolute' privileges granted must be periodically renewed by means of new texts. The claim to perpetuity that Edgar's grant itself makes is further invalidated by the confirmations by later kings appended to this text as it appears in the *Relatio*, and in Hugh's narrative.⁷⁰ Though the E text does not incorporate these later reconfirmations, the importance of this grant as an instrument of validation is paramount.

The grant of Edgar occurs at a dramatic moment in the narrative, when documents containing 'written' evidence regarding the abbey's ancient privileges are discovered hidden in the abbey walls, and brought to the king. This is undoubtedly a reference to the *Relatio Heddae* itself, and an attempt to justify and validate its existence. But in incorporating a version of the charter in the *Chronicle* as well as giving a justification for its existence, we have here a case of both external and internal cross-referencing. The external cross-referencing is demonstrable proof of the frenzied literary activity preceding and surrounding the *Chronicle* at Peterborough – the forging of the charters, the construction of the *Relatio Heddae*, and perhaps the compilation of the *Liber Niger*, whose twelfth-century portion is usually dated

⁶⁷ For the emphasis on the miraculous in *Hugh Candidus*, see Chapter 4, pp. 159–68.

⁶⁸ For example, Gransden, 'Traditionalism and Continuity', pp. 159–207, and Brooks, *Early History of the Church of Canterbury*, pp. 255–66.

⁶⁹ An event noted *s.a.* 964 A; version E, however, only notes the expulsion from Old Minster.

⁷⁰ See Mellows, ed., *Hugh Candidus*, pp. 39–42.

around 1130.⁷¹ But the internal cross-referencing is more complex. The *Chronicle* mentions the charters by name, specifically referring to Wulfhere's grant, or Agatho's Bull; in comparison, the later text of *Hugh Candidus* only has the very general phrase 'antiqua priuilegia' (ancient privileges). On the one hand, this indicates the hybrid nature of the vernacular *Chronicle*, where it is partly serving the function of a local chronicle-cartulary, while simultaneously meshing Peterborough history with the timeline of national history. However, this simple method of cross-referencing also achieves a kind of textual truth where, in whatever form they may be inserted, the documents have an internal validity and existence with respect to the other entries, not just in relation to the 'originals' from which they are derived. This is a unique feature of the E *Chronicle*, and striking enough to merit attention.⁷²

The Peterborough Interpolations considered so far thus reveal a complex relationship between power and authority and their modes of validation. They are united in emphasising the happy traditional association of *Medeshamstede* with Anglo-Saxon royal power, which confers authority ('onsting') on the monastery as a freely given act of love. As projected through the texts, this power seems benign enough to grant perpetual freedom to the monastery, even from itself. This results in a strange logical fallacy. What these documents claim to prove is total internal authority for the abbey and independence from any kind of secular authority. Such autonomy it claims from secular royal authority itself, which grants this power by nullifying, to an extent, its own authority. Not only these narratives, but also most diplomatic texts making extravagant claims to authority, partake of this fallacy. As such unconditional transfers of power would be difficult to conceive of in actual political contexts, the authority claimed is only valid within the de-politicised scenario created within the text, and enforced by an increased emphasis on its written form.

The interpolation in annal 963 forms a kind of watershed, expanding its focus from a narrative of land grants to a wider narrative of ecclesias-

⁷¹ See Martin, *The Cartularies and Registers of Peterborough Abbey*, p. 1. T. A. M. Bishop, 'Notes on Cambridge Manuscripts, Part I', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 1 (1949–53), 432–41, p. 440, notes that 'some internal evidence suggests that the work of this scribe belongs to the second quarter of the twelfth century'. Kelly suggests the possibility of a later date based on the scribal correspondences between the scribe of the twelfth-century portion of the *Liber Niger* and the hand of the Second Continuation; see Kelly, ed., *Charters of Peterborough Abbey*, p. 88. The implications of these scribal correspondences will be dealt with in Chapter 3, pp. 105–10.

⁷² The only comparable instance is the incorporation of diplomatic in the F version at Canterbury. However, the F compiler seems more interested in modifying the diplomatic documents inserted in his text so as to bring them in line with his Latin 'originals', clearly implying their external and independent existence. The strategies of this text are analysed in detail in Chapter 3, pp. 111–20.

tical acquisitions. It notes the gifts Dunstan gave to the monastery, as well as property gains made by Abbot Ealdwulf. It also narrates that Abbot Cenwulf, his successor, built a wall around the monastery. Bound and secured by royal privileges, as well as physically enclosed by a boundary wall, the abbey is now given a new name, *Burch* ('stronghold' or 'fortified place'). The narrative also briefly notes the translation of the bodies of St Cyneburh, St Cyneswith and St Tibba to Peterborough by Abbot Ælfsige, which is detailed in *Hugh Candidus*.⁷³ The reference to Peterborough abbots also sets the tone for the non-diplomatic interpolations, which chart the fortunes of the abbey as a whole. However, before moving on to a survey of these annals, a few charter-based interpolations need to be considered.

Between the Bull of Pope Agatho *s.a.* 675 and the account of the restoration of *Medeshamstede* by Bishop Æthelwold *s.a.* 963 occur records of a number of minor land transactions. Annal 777 notes Abbot Beonna's lease of ten holdings at Swineshead to Ealdorman Cuthbert, a grant presumably witnessed by important dignitaries like King Offa, King Ecgfrith and other important ecclesiastics.⁷⁴ The same annal also records Ealdorman Brorda's grant of Woking to *Medeshamstede* with the king's consent. Royal power then placed the church of Woking solely under the jurisdiction of *Medeshamstede*, freeing it 'wið cining 7 wið biscop 7 wið eorl 7 wiþ ealle men, swa þet nan man ne hæfde þær nan onsting buton Sancte Peter 7 þone abbot'.⁷⁵ A charter of King Offa recording Brorda's grant is also present in the *Liber Niger*, and that Woking was a colony of the abbey was obviously part of Peterborough tradition.⁷⁶ Most extant versions of *Hugh Candidus* do not record this grant, or even mention Woking, but the version of Hugh's text recorded in the cartulary of Robert Swaffham inserts 'Wocingas' as a colony of *Medeshamstede*.⁷⁷ Abbot Ceolred's lease of Sempringham to Wulfred is noted *s.a.* 852, a property which would revert back to the abbey after the latter's death.⁷⁸ Ceadwalla's grant of 'Hoge' (Hoo) is noted *s.a.* 686, and this is also part of a composite document present in the *Liber Niger*, consisting of a grant by Ceadwalla, an additional grant by Swaefheard, king of Kent, and a confirmation by Æthelred,

⁷³ Cynewulf and Cyneswith were sisters to King Wulfhere, Tibba was their relative. For the importance of the hagiographic element in *Hugh Candidus*, see Chapter 4, pp. 159–68.

⁷⁴ This document occurs on fol. 41 of the *Liber Niger*, noted S 1412, and Kelly, ed., *Charters of Peterborough Abbey*, pp. 202–5.

⁷⁵ 'from king and from bishop and from earl and from all men, so that no man at all had any authority there except Saint Peter and the bishop'. The repeated use of the word *onsting* to denote authority is discussed below, see Chapter 2, p. 66.

⁷⁶ See Keynes, *Councils of Clofesho*, p. 42.

⁷⁷ Mellows suggested that this should be Wicken rather than Woking, see Mellows, ed., *Hugh Candidus*, p. 15.

⁷⁸ Kelly, ed., *Charters of Peterborough Abbey*, pp. 215–21.

king of the Mercians.⁷⁹ While Ceadwalla's grant contrasts strangely with an account of the ravaging of Kent by Ceadwalla and his brother Mul, the nearby annal 688 records Ceadwalla's baptism and adoption of monastic orders, which may have made the insertion of this grant (which could certainly be regarded as an act of piety) seem apposite.

In contrast to the spurious documentation regarding the grants of Wulfhere, Agatho or Edgar, it is possible to regard these interpolations as based on genuine documentation, as no forgery would be likely to record alienation of property, even in the form of a lease. These references to genuine land transactions reinforce the sense of space created by the earlier spurious documentation, imbuing a symbolic textual space with a geographical reality, evoking names and places that would presumably be clearly identifiable to the audience of this text. But it is also possible that the inclusion of this information was motivated by a sense of context. The surrounding entries derived from the base text mostly record internecine wars between the kingdoms of Northumbria, Mercia and Wessex, as well as the wars against the Danes. A few random examples make the point: annal 778 notes Ælfwald of Northumbria's succession to the throne after driving out his predecessor Æthelred; 784 notes the feud between Cynewulf and Cyneheard, where the extended story of the *Chronicle* rightly belongs; 792 notes the martyrdom of King Æthelberht by Offa of Mercia; 796 notes how Ceolwulf, king of Mercia, ravaged Kent; 823 records political unrest in the various kingdoms; and 851 notes that the Danish fleet wintered in Thanet. In these troubled times, when boundaries between kingdoms were constantly being redefined, the continued existence of Peterborough abbey is asserted through both spurious and genuine documentation, with the land transactions lending validity to the abbey's self-image as a community capable of prospering even in adverse conditions. As the subsequent analysis reveals, this use of the base text as a mode of intensifying the narrative is further evident in the non-diplomatic insertions, and has important consequences for our perception of this version of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*.⁸⁰

The narrative based on spurious documents creates a historical past that gains credence and validity by emphasising the written nature of its sources, and by a system of internal cross-referencing. The annals recording land transactions, by referring to documenta-

⁷⁹ Keynes, *Councils of Clofesho*, p. 41. The grant occurs on folio 36 of the *Liber Niger*, see S 233, and Kelly, ed., *Charters of Peterborough Abbey*, pp. 186–98.

⁸⁰ Note particularly the use of pre-existent context in the narratives of disaster, for example the raid of Hereward, *s.a.* 1070, and the burning of the abbey in 1116, see below, pp. 44–9 and p. 53.

tion genuine in some form, provide a definite link with Peterborough abbey's first official source of authority, the *Liber Niger*, which may indeed have been contemporary with the E text. The thematic link between all these documents is their consistent focus on survival; how Peterborough is able to retain and revalidate its Anglo-Saxon heritage even though the abbey is plundered by the Danish army, and how it seemingly accumulates its holdings and conducts business at a time which is historically recorded as insecure in a traditional text like the *Chronicle*. These themes and concerns are re-emphasised again and again in the course of the later Peterborough narratives, even when the text is continued by a different chronicler.

The course of Peterborough history

The non-diplomatic interpolations appear to be (at least at first sight) rather boring in form and mundane in content, especially in comparison to the rhetorically striking diplomatic insertions. They consist either of notices relating to Peterborough abbots, or accounts of tribulations and ravages suffered by the monastery. Barring the one entry at 870 recording the destruction of the abbey by the Danes, they concern events within the period 1013 to 1116. Most of these insertions are also made at the end of pre-existent entries, the only exceptions being the entry for 1107, which inserts the accession of Abbot Ernulf in the middle of the annal, and 1070, which narrates the raid of Hereward. The re-compilation and re-writing of the *Chronicle* necessarily raises issues about how the interpolated or 'new' text interacts with the inherited or 'old' version of the text. In the case of the Peterborough text, the textual tensions inherent in reconciling a different generic form to the annal structure of the *Chronicle* are more overt in the diplomatic entries. Nevertheless, a more subtle kind of accommodation is called for in the non-diplomatic insertions, which do not necessarily form a significant portion of the annal, but are relatively shorter text portions appended to earlier annals having an existence independent of Peterborough.

As the Peterborough manuscript is written in one hand until 1121, the general layout of the manuscript gives little indication (especially for those annals containing the insertions) of exactly where the inherited text of the *Chronicle* ends and where the interpolated text begins.⁸¹ Though linguistic difference is an important instrument of recognition, the linguistic markers belonging to a later period of

⁸¹ The edition of the text by Irvine notes the interpolations in a smaller font size, and also records the erasures and modifications present in these sections of the text. Nevertheless, the integration of the interpolations remains remarkably seamless in terms of content.

composition are far more obvious in the extended narratives of the First and Second Continuations than in the shorter Interpolations. The only other text nearly contemporary with the E text, and derived partly from its archetype, is version F from Christ Church, Canterbury, but that is incomplete in its extant form. The D version, though it agrees in places with E, is not consistently parallel, and is therefore unhelpful for sustained comparison.⁸² To make matters more complicated, the provenance of the annals from 1062 to 1121 remains unknown – they may have originated at Canterbury, though that cannot be definitely asserted. From 1079 to 1154, the *Peterborough Chronicle* remains the only extant *Chronicle* version. However, the annals of the E text to 1121 seem to have been made use of by other contemporary historians, like John of Worcester or Henry of Huntingdon, and most notably by the compiler of the WA.⁸³ The Latin annals in the WA are close matches with the corresponding sections in the E text, which leads to the natural conclusion that the entries in the WA are fairly literal translations of the Old English ‘originals’, and that the Peterborough text reproduces the annals of its archetype quite accurately. The WA are thus instrumental in an analysis of the writing and compilation of the annals before 1121, and the translated Latin annals are invaluable in determining exactly how much text was inserted at Peterborough. By comparing the Latin entries with those in the E text, one may ascertain, with reasonable accuracy, the text portions that have been inserted later. In the analysis which follows, the annals in the WA will be essential in assessing the textual negotiations undertaken by the Peterborough compiler in the insertion of local narrative in the received proto-E version.⁸⁴

⁸² See Clark, ed., *The Peterborough Chronicle*, p. xix: ‘D and E agree in general as far as the entry for 1031 ... After 1031 the two versions D and E are independent for over twenty five years; but from 1057 onwards D again shares some entries with E, and is apparently derived from a conflation of a pre-E type of text (earlier than the version behind F, since it lacks the entries taken from the *Annales de Rouen*) with one of a C-type.’

⁸³ Noted by Clark, ed., *The Peterborough Chronicle*, pp. xix–xx. Also noted by Plummer, ed., *Saxon Chronicles*, II, pp. lii–lvi, and Irvine, ed., *MS E*, pp. lxxxiv–lxxxv. For a wider perspective on the links between vernacular and Latin historiography in the twelfth century, see Chapter 3, pp. 120–34.

⁸⁴ Here a qualifying comment needs to be made regarding comparison with the WA. The above survey has implicitly assumed Clark’s view that this text derives from a proto-E type, and not E itself as Luard held it to be. This has also been corroborated by Irvine, ed., *MS E*, pp. xxxiv–xxxv. However, the exact relationship between the WA and the E text remains unclear. Instances where the corresponding Latin entries in the WA do not match the E entry at all (for example 1041 E, or particularly 1070 E where the WA entry matches 1072 D and 1071 E), or where there are minor variations between the texts (e.g. 1103), highlight the problems in positing a clear line of textual transmission. The possibility of multiple versions between the proto-E accessed by the compiler of the WA, and that used by the Peterborough compiler, cannot be ignored. These complex textual relationships between Latin and Old English historiography in this period certainly need to be addressed in an updated critical edition of the Latin text.

Unlike the annals based on charters, the non-diplomatic interpolations cannot be sourced back to texts of independent existence. The possibility remains that these insertions may have been based on some kind of abbey tradition, oral or written,⁸⁵ and their contents, especially the narrative of Peterborough abbots, are more extensively noted in *Hugh Candidus*.⁸⁶ As these entries are usually combined with a pre-existent annal, the contexts in which they are placed are therefore of paramount importance in the present analysis. The annals themselves may be broadly divided into two categories, dealing either with the notices of abbots, or with the disasters suffered by the monastery, even though a cursory glance at the contents should make it apparent that this is more a matter of convenience than any absolute classification. The entries range from short notices, *s.a.* 1069 (the death of Abbot Brand) or 1103 (the death of Abbot Matthew), to the extended narrative of the raid of Hereward in 1070. However, as the following analysis demonstrates, their textual accommodation involves subtle and complex narrative strategies.

Raids, ravages and Hereward

The first mention of the disasters suffered by the abbey is the ravaging of the monastery by Danish armies, noted *s.a.* 870. Writing later in the twelfth century, Hugh would narrate this incident at great length (as an occasion to launch into a homiletic exercise about the mysterious ways in which God works),⁸⁷ but the annal in the E text is brief in comparison, and emphasises the stark intensity of the attack by using alliteration and contrasting clauses.⁸⁸ The total plunder of

⁸⁵ Irvine, ed., *MS E*, p. xci notes that the interpolations contain more erasures and scribal errors than the rest of the text which may imply difficulty in reading the exemplar or simultaneous translation of sources when writing. This raises the possibility of either direct translation, especially of the Latin diplomatic texts, or the presence of an abbey history in some kind of 'working draft', which was subsequently lost. It is also possible that both processes were involved at some level.

⁸⁶ The chronology of *Hugh Candidus* roughly follows the timeline of Peterborough abbots to the time of William of Waterville. For the relation between this and the E text, see Chapter 4, pp. 146–68.

⁸⁷ See Mellows, ed., *Hugh Candidus*, pp. 76–9.

⁸⁸ 'On þa ilcan tima þa comon hi to *Medeshamstede*, beorndon 7 bræcon, slogon abbot 7 munecas 7 eall þet hi þær fundon, macedon hit þa þet ær wæs ful rice, þa hit wearð to nan þing.' (At the same time they came to *Medeshamstede*; burned and destroyed; slew the abbot and monks; and all that they found there, made it thus that where there was before great richness, that turned to nothing). Interestingly, this entry is the only instance in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* where the ravaging of a monastery by the Danes is recorded, see P. H. Sawyer, *The Age of the Vikings*, 2nd edn (London, 1971), pp. 20–1. The 'Common Stock' of the *Chronicle* has much information regarding the movements of the Danish armies, but mentions no instance of the plunder of a monastery, which leads Sawyer to conclude that the 'audience for whom this *Chronicle* [i.e. the 'Common Stock'] was intended seems therefore to have been lay rather than ecclesiastical'. The mention of it in the E text has been regarded as an indication of the change in audience.

the monastery then serves as the background of the narrative of the re-establishment of *Medeshamstede* by Bishop Æthelwold, and the grant of King Edgar.⁸⁹

The revolt of Hereward 'the Wake' noted *s.a.* 1070 is the next point of crisis for the monastery, and it is worth considering this in some detail in order to discern the narrative strategies used by the Peterborough compiler. There is no mention of this revolt in the A version, as 1070 is the terminal vernacular annal continuing as the Latin *Acta Lanfranci*. It is the D text, or the Worcester manuscript, that has the earliest mention of this event noted *s.a.* 1071 and 1072, and may have been written in a contemporary or a near-contemporary hand.⁹⁰ A comparison with the WA shows that the Latin entry for 1070 does not match the annal in the E text at all, but corresponds instead to 1072 D. This annal mismatch led Clark to conclude that the WA could not have been derived from E itself.⁹¹ However, a comparison of the D and E versions reveals that 1072 D corresponds closely to 1071 E, apart from minor differences in phrasing. It is possible that there were multiple versions between the proto-E as accessed by the compiler of the WA (which resulted in some chronological dislocation) and the text which was ultimately used at Peterborough, but that is yet to be ascertained.⁹²

The D annals focus on the rebels' reconnaissance at Ely, and the conqueror's subsequent blockade, so the information may have been derived from a local source.⁹³ Besides the information in *Domesday Book*, these annals are amongst the earliest extant information about Hereward. The entry in E not only demonstrates the subtle stylistic strategies by which the event is narrated from a purely Peterborough

⁸⁹ See above, pp. 38–9.

⁹⁰ See Ker, *Catalogue*, p. 254, and C. Hart, 'Hereward the Wake and his Companions', in *The Danelaw* (London and Rio Grande, 1992), pp. 625–48, p. 630. Parts of 1070 E correspond to 1071 D, see below, pp. 45–9, and Irvine, ed., *MS E*, p. lxxxiii.

⁹¹ See Clark, ed., *The Peterborough Chronicle*, p. xix.

⁹² The conclusions drawn in the RS edition (Luard, *Annales Monastici* II) regarding the relationship between this text and E can be considered to be obsolete. Luard contends that the WA drew directly upon the E text, rather than a pre-existent version. The problems in determining the exact relation between the WA and the proto-E are yet to be addressed adequately in current scholarship. Also see Chapter 3, pp. 121–2.

⁹³ Annal 1072 D relates that William was able to capture Bishop Æthelwine, Earl Morcar and their companions, but not Hereward, who courageously helped some of the rebels to escape. The rebels had chosen Ely as their stronghold because of the suitability of its location for defence. This traditional association with Ely spawned local heroic legends regarding Hereward as a figure of resistance. The account of the Conqueror's campaign against Ely may be supplemented by the material in Book II of the *Liber Eliensis*. The *Liber Eliensis* also makes use of another source, the *Gesta Herewardi*, containing recollections of some of Hereward's followers, compiled by the monk Richard of Ely in the first half of the twelfth century which (ironically enough) is now extant as part of a Peterborough cartulary, that of Robert of Swaffham.

point of view (where Hereward is constructed as villain rather than hero), but also shows the way in which the original entry in the base text was transformed to accommodate the abbey's agenda. *Hugh Candidus* agrees with E regarding the main points of the incident and in the portrayal of Hereward. It is possible that both draw on an earlier version of Hereward's story, which was subsequently lost. Hugh's narrative explicitly condemns Hereward's role, and sets the revolt within the perspective of diabolical motive,⁹⁴ and adds that many believed in Hereward not just because he promised them freedom from Norman rule, but also because he was *homo monachorum*, 'a man of the monks'.⁹⁵

This didactic tone in *Hugh Candidus* is noticeably absent from the E text, as are other contextual digressions. The narrative moves rapidly, and the impression of causality is further buttressed by the profusion of parallel clauses and temporal adverbs carrying the narrative forward.⁹⁶ The language of the narrative uses all its resources to convey the enormity of Hereward's act – the plunder of the monastery and the utter disregard of the ravagers for the sanctity of its holy objects are indicated by the list of objects taken away by force. This portion of the narrative relies on a heavy use of verbs of violence or taking away, sometimes repeating a word for added intensity. The frequent use of *namen* or *clumben*, when combined with the other verbs of violence like *forbærndon* or *todrefodon*, intensifies the losses suffered by the monastery. The most common action in this part of the narrative is a climbing up and bringing down, and the precious objects are literally and metaphorically brought down from their position of eminence.⁹⁷

⁹⁴ Hugh refers to a prophecy made by the Devil to Bishop Æthelric: 'Adiecit eciam dicens sese tribus uicibus uindicaturum de monachis et de monasterio, dixitque modum, primitus expulsurum se omnes monachos et omnia bona ecclesie dari diripienda dixit. Et alia uice omne monasterium per ignem destruendum iactauit. Hec duo prophetica scimus iam esse completa.' (He [the Devil] said also that he would avenge himself three times on the monks and the monastery, and likewise he would first drive out all the monks and give all the goods of the church to be despoiled. On another occasion he boasted that he would give all the monastery to be destroyed by fire. These two prophecies, as we know were fulfilled.) See Chapter 4, p. 160.

⁹⁵ Hereward seems to have been a tenant of the abbey, perhaps on a more long-term basis, rather than a direct landowner, see Hart, 'Hereward the Wake and his Companions', pp. 626–7.

⁹⁶ This is similar to narrative causality in the annals derived from the spurious charters. For the text see Irvine, ed., *MS E*, pp. 88–9.

⁹⁷ 'Ac hi na rohten na þing ... clumben upp to þe halge rode, namen þa þe kynehelm of ure Drih\ t/ nes heafod ... clumben upp to þe stepel, brohton dune þet hæcce þe þær wæs behid, hit wæs eall of \gold / 7 of seolfre. Hi namen þære twa gildene scrines 7 .ix. seolferne, 7 hi namen fifteen mycele roden, ge of golde ge of seolfre. Hi namen þære swa mycele gold 7 seolfre 7 swa manega gersumas on sceat 7 on scrud 7 on bokes swa nan man ne mæi oðer tællen' (But they did not reckon anything, climbed up to the holy cross, then seized the royal crown from our Lord's head which was all of beaten gold; climbed up to the steeple, brought down the altar frontal that was concealed there, it was all of gold and silver. They took from there two golden shrines and nine [of] silver,

The actions of the raiders imply an overreaching on their part, but are also simultaneously representative of the abbey's fall from a position of security. The secure space, real and symbolic, created through the charter entries, and through the image of enclosure in annal 963, is now breached irrevocably.

Significant here is the strange deviation in the E text in comparison to *Hugh Candidus*, which also narrates this plunder in detail. Hugh further notes how Prior Æthelwold was successful in saving the arm of St Oswald, the most precious relic that Peterborough owned, but the E text makes no mention of this at all.⁹⁸ Both narratives declare (perhaps as a conventional statement) that the loss was beyond estimation. Both texts also note that the plunder was carried to Denmark and placed in a royal manor, but neither gives a definite location,⁹⁹ and they also narrate that the church where the treasures were placed was burned down. But *Hugh Candidus*, not the E text, further notes that Yware the 'church-keeper', the very resourceful abbey inmate who had alerted Turolf, was later able to take back some of this treasure to the monastery. One may wonder why these extra details are not present in the E text at all. The simplest way would be to dismiss them as unavailable to the compiler of E. Nevertheless, though we can in no way prove that the compiler of the *Peterborough Chronicle* suppresses information, it is also true that, even if this extra information was available to the Peterborough compiler, its inclusion would have lessened the effect of total loss that is conveyed by the annal as it stands. The text's very silence regarding the specificities seems to make the abbey's loss seem irreparable, and therefore greater. Through personal interjection and alliteration that is particularly reminiscent of annal 1066, this entry conveys the impression that the past cannot be recovered.¹⁰⁰ For, even though Turolf resumes services at Peterborough and Æthelric excommunicates the rebels,¹⁰¹ the 'yfel dæde' done by them marks a kind of fall for the monastery:

and they seized fifteen great crosses, both of gold and silver. They took away from there so much gold and silver and so many treasures in garments and vestments and in books as no man may tell of any other [instance]).

⁹⁸ For the implications of this, see Chapter 4, pp. 160–8.

⁹⁹ The E text leaves a gap, while *Hugh Candidus* says 'a certain royal villa'.

¹⁰⁰ For a discussion of 1066, see pp. 51–2 below.

¹⁰¹ Hereward, one of the great figures of popular tradition, was probably among the lesser figures of the revolt, which involved important personalities like Earl Morcar and Bishop Æthelwine, and prominent landowners like Turkil of Harringworth and Siward Bearn. As Hart, 'Hereward the Wake and his Companions', p. 648, points out, his fame (and notoriety) was probably due to the fact that he was a local figure. But perhaps, both the praise accounts of the Ely tradition and the Peterborough presentation of him as a ravager of their monastery occlude a historical context, and Hart comments that ultimately the rebels' quarrel 'was not with the monks of the pre-Conquest foundation, who had been his landlords, but with the Norman usurpers of the abbey estates' (p. 648).

Dus wæs se mynstre of Burch forbærnd 7 forhærgod; ælmihtig God hit gemiltse þurh his mycele mildhertnesse!¹⁰²

This account echoes the previous ravages by Scandinavian armies in the earlier portion of the text,¹⁰³ as well as in other *Chronicle* versions. The annal 1068 D, for example, records the Danish raid on York, and the havoc it caused.¹⁰⁴ Though variations occur in parallel accounts of the destruction caused by the Scandinavian armies (as in 1068 D), the exact phrase *forbærnd 7 forhærgod* in the Peterborough text only occurs in a similar collocation in King Alfred's Preface to his translation of Gregory's *Cura Pastoralis*, where he laments the destruction caused by the Danish armies. Alfred recalls a past time, 'ær ðæm ðe hit eall forhergod wære ond forbærned, hu ða ciricean giond eall Angelcynn stodon maðma ond boca gefyldæ'.¹⁰⁵ If indeed a literary echo and an allusion to Alfred's lament regarding the state of learning in England, then the Peterborough compiler has effectively appropriated a phrase with larger metaphorical overtones (and one used with variations in other *Chronicle* texts) for an immediate, local context.¹⁰⁶ The raid of Hereward thus acquires the catastrophic qualities of all earlier Danish raids, and the treasures stolen by the rebels become important not only for their physical value but as symbols of a greater loss. The abbey is 'forbærnd 7 forhærgod' both literally and metaphorically. The loss of its precious objects is not just the loss of its carefully accumulated wealth, but also a loss of that which constituted its very identity.

The plunder of the monastery is then placed against the stark background of famine, 'Ða wæs mycel hunger þæs geares'. It should be noted here that the entry for 1071 in the D version is remarkably similar to portions of 1070 E, barring the section on Hereward. The

¹⁰² 'Thus was the minster of Burch ravaged and burned down, may the Almighty God have mercy on it through his great compassion!'

¹⁰³ See for example, 999 E ('fornæh ealle Weastcentingas fordydon 7 forhergodan'), 1003 E ('hi ða burh gehergodon 7 forbærndon), or 1006 E ('se denisca flota ... hergodon 7 bærndon 7 slogon').

¹⁰⁴ '7 eac þæt halie mynster sanctus Petrus eal forhergod 7 forbærnod' (and ravaged and burned the holy monastery of Saint Peter).

¹⁰⁵ 'before they were all ravaged and burned, how the churches all over the English [land] stood filled with books and treasures'. I base my statement on proximity searches of the Old English Corpus, see <http://ets.umd.umich.edu/o/oec/> (last accessed 25 January 2014). This use of doublets as a means of intensification is one of the hallmarks of the style of Archbishop Wulfstan, see A. McIntosh, 'Wulfstan's Prose', in E. G. Stanley, ed., *British Academy Papers on Anglo-Saxon England* (Oxford, 1990), pp. 111–44, and Dorothy Bethurum, ed., *The Homilies of Wulfstan* (Oxford, 1957), pp. 87–98. It is also a common feature in the Old English Bede and Wærferth's version of Pope Gregory's *Dialogues*, see Dorothy Whitelock, 'The Prose of Alfred's Reign', *Continuations and Beginnings: Studies in Old English Literature*, ed. E. G. Stanley (London, 1966), pp. 67–103, p. 78.

¹⁰⁶ This echoing of an earlier text cannot be totally dismissed. The possibility of Pope Agatho's Bull being a conscious echo of Bede's *Lives of the Abbots* has already been noted, see above, pp. 36–7.

similarity in phrasing and content between sections of 1070 E and 1071 D leads to the inference that the original annal in E's base text, if not identical to 1071 D, was similar in form. This supposition is strengthened by the remarkable similarity between 1072 E and 1072 D. In its present form, 1070 E still retains remnants of the previous annal version, but the pre-existent entry is split apart by the insertion of the Peterborough narrative. If the D version had not existed for comparison, there would be no way of telling which portions of the 1070 E entry belong to separate times and places of composition.¹⁰⁷ The mention of the famine and the arrival of the Danish fleet all seem to blend in with the account of the 'revolt', intensifying through context the narrative of ravage and plunder. In this one annal, which deals with an event specifically related to the abbey, the compiler had the chance completely to rework the original entry. It remains significant that he does not eliminate the pre-existent text, but uses the received text to intensify the impact of the new inserted text. It is an indication not just of his literary ability, but also of his consistent contextual awareness. Through subtle omission of detail, the consistent association of verbs of violence with the ravagers, and the use of pre-existent text portions as a means of intensification, the E text belittles Hereward through language and narrative. The provincial bias of the narrative remains apparent: the revolt is never seen as national opposition,¹⁰⁸ and the monks of Peterborough prefer the order represented by their new Norman abbot to the anarchy threatened by Hereward.

Peterborough and the wider world: content and context

Two aspects of the compiler's technique are apparent in annal 1070. He is definitely aware of the nuances of the pre-existent context, and retains the inherited annal even when he had the opportunity to eliminate it entirely. Further, this material is usually used to intensify his narrative, which is structured so as to make its ideological focus apparent. As an extended interpolation, 1070 demonstrates the full range of this compiler's strategies, which may also be discerned in the other interpolations.

The accession of Ernulf, formerly prior of Canterbury, as abbot of Peterborough is inserted in the middle of annal 1107, and placed within the appropriate context of King Henry's reshuffling of the ecclesiastical system and the appointment of bishops and abbots for

¹⁰⁷ In this case, the corresponding entry in the WA provides no match for 1070 E.

¹⁰⁸ The annal presents us with no definite sense of national identity; the outlaws are noted as Danish, Turolf's party as French, but the 'English' people of the Fenlands think that the outlaws will win the land.

monasteries where such positions were vacant.¹⁰⁹ Likewise, annal 963 notes, amongst other things, the succession of Abbot Ælfsige, who was responsible for the translation of the bodies of St Cyneburh, St Cyneswith and St Tibba to Peterborough.¹¹⁰ This forms a narrative link between annal 963 and the next Peterborough insertion at annal 1013, where the same abbot, Ælfsige, is mentioned again. The text appended to the annal entry for 1013 narrates how Ælfsige, during his stay in France with Queen Emma, acquired the relics of St Florentin from the ravaged monastery of Bonneval for the payment of five hundred pounds. This acquisition, also noted in *Hugh Candidus* in close textual proximity to the account of the translation of the saints noted *s.a.* 963 E, certainly lent more lustre to Peterborough's collection of relics, though the E text does not emphasise this. However, as Hugh notes further, the deal was, from the point of view of the monks of Bonneval at least, certainly made under duress.¹¹¹ If the compiler of the E text was aware of this, his text does not reveal it, and this may be dictated by a sense of context. This narrative is part of the received entry which recorded Swein's attack on England, a part of the set of annals recording Æthelred's reign, and written retrospectively after the events had already occurred.¹¹² The comparable Latin entry in the WA is closely parallel to most of the vernacular entry as it stands in the E text, and the original entry did mention Ælfsige as the abbot who accompanied Queen Emma to Normandy.¹¹³ The abbot's acquisition of the relics is noted after his visit to Normandy, but the E text merely hints at what the narrative of *Hugh Candidus* strongly emphasises: that Ælfsige was instrumental in making Peterborough abbey's relic base

¹⁰⁹ For the text of the pre-existent annal, and the Peterborough Interpolation, see Irvine, ed., *MS E*, p. 115.

¹¹⁰ It should also be noted here that Edgar's grant is the last diplomatic text made use of in the E version, which, unlike *Hugh Candidus*, does not reiterate further confirmations made by Edward and Ethelred (Edgar's sons), King Cnut, Edward the Confessor and William the Conqueror. After this entry, *Medeshamstede* is consistently referred to as *Burch* in both texts. For the detailed account of the translation of these 'saints' see Mellows, ed., *Hugh Candidus*, pp. 50–2.

¹¹¹ 'Vnde monachi predicti monasterii sancti Florentini pro tali commutatione gemunt per secula, sicuti nobis retulerunt quidam ex ipsis qui eum requirere et orare uenerant in Angliam.' (Wherefore the monks of the aforesaid monastery of S. Florentin do perpetually groan by reason of their bargain, as was reported to us by certain of those who had come to England to resort and pray to him.) See Mellows, ed., *Hugh Candidus*, p. 49.

¹¹² See Simon Keynes, 'The Declining Reputation of King Æthelred the Unready', *Æthelred the Unready: Papers from the Millenary Conference*, ed. D. Hill (Oxford, 1978), pp. 227–53, especially pp. 229–31. Keynes suggests that the annals may have been put together between 1016 and 1023.

¹¹³ '7 seo hlafdige wende þa ofer seo to here broðor Ricarde. 7 Ælfsige abbot of Burh with here' (And the lady [i.e. Queen Emma] went over the sea to her brother Richard. And Ælfsige, abbot of Burch with her). Compare 1013 in the WA: 'et Emma regina mare transiens venit ad Ricardum fratrem suum, et Elsig abbas eum ea' (and Queen Emma went across the sea to her brother Richard, and Abbot Ælfsige [went] with her).

stronger.¹¹⁴ The juxtaposition of these two narratives, one belonging to an earlier annal entry and the other made at Peterborough in the twelfth century, results in a striking textual effect. The Danish attacks and the subsequent political turmoil may be contrasted with the clever acquisitions made by the abbot of Peterborough. This is further heightened by the description of the monks of Bonneval, 'ærm stede, ærm abbot 7 ærme muneces, forþan þe hi forhergode wæron', a misery intensified by the repetition of 'ærm' (wretched).¹¹⁵

Annal 1066 records the coming of William the Conqueror and the death of Abbot Leofric. The entry notes the defeat of Harold and the coming of William, marking a turning point in English history and politics, perhaps heralded by the 'comet' noted in the same annal. This is also noted in *Chronicle* versions C and D in closely parallel language. As an event of enormous magnitude, it is noted in greater detail in the other versions, perhaps even given a personal tone in version D.¹¹⁶ The acquisitive nature of William's conquest is evoked in the E text through the alliteration and etymological play ('guldon' and 'gyld').¹¹⁷ For Peterborough as well, this year brings change, set in motion by the death of Abbot Leofric. The chronicler, with the perspective of hindsight, is aware that things would never be the same again.

On his dæg wæs ealle blisse 7 ealle gode on Burh ... 7 He dyde swa mycel to gode into þet mynstre of Burh on geolde 7 on seolfre 7 on scrud 7 and on lande swa nefre nan oðre ne dyde toforen him ne nan æfter him. Þa wearð Gildene Burh to Wrecce Burh.¹¹⁸

¹¹⁴ In comparison to the later text of *Hugh Candidus*, the E text seems uninterested in mentioning the relics present at Peterborough. As has been noted in the preceding analysis, 1070 makes no mention of the incidents surrounding Peterborough's most important relic, the arm of St Oswald. Further, *Hugh Candidus* has a lengthy section describing not just the relics present at Peterborough but also an account of the resting places of the saints over all England, see Mellows, ed., *Hugh Candidus*, pp. 52–64. The implications of this absence of hagiographic material for the later survival of the E text are analysed further in Chapter 4, pp. 159–68.

¹¹⁵ '[a] wretched place, wretched abbot and wretched monks, because they had been ravaged'. This is the closest that the E text gets to hint at what *Hugh Candidus* specifically mentions, the fact that the deal may have been made under duress.

¹¹⁶ 'Swapeah leide gyld on mannum swiðe stið ... 7 Wyllelm eorl belifen her æfter 7 worhton castelas wide geond þas þeode, 7 earm folc swencte, 7 a syððan hit ylfe swiðe. Wurðe\god/se ende þonne God wylle.' (Nevertheless [he] laid very harsh taxes on men ... and Earl William remained here after [that] and wrought castles widely around this land. And wretched people oppressed, and always after that it grew worse. May it end well when God wills it.) Note the similarity in phrasing ('worhton castelas', 'earm folc swencte') with the poem on King William in 1086 E.

¹¹⁷ '7 Ealdred arcebisceop hine to cygne gehalgode, 7 men guldon him gyld 7 gislas sealdon. 7 syððan heora land bohtan.' (And Archbishop Ealdred consecrated him as king. And men rendered him money-payment and gave hostages and after that acquired (lit. 'bought') their land.)

¹¹⁸ 'In his day was all bliss and all joy in Burch ... And he did so much towards the good of that monastery of Burch, in gold and in silver and in vestments and in land as no

While the similarity of sound associates 'Gildene' (golden) with the 'gyld' (tribute) that William had obtained, the difference in meaning between the words serves as a poignant contrast. There seems to be a degree of irony when Leofric's successor, Abbot Brand, is designated as 'swiðe god man 7 swiðe wis',¹¹⁹ especially given his disastrous alliance with Edgar Atheling. The annal notes the tensions and the decidedly lukewarm relations between Peterborough and the Conqueror, and this is a marked contrast to the abbey's projected relationship with the Anglo-Saxon kings of the past. The Norman Conquest denotes, for the nation as well as the monastery, the passing of an era.¹²⁰

Disasters, again and again

The Peterborough insertion in 1066 laments the 'dræuednysse' and 'ifele' that has befallen the monastery, and this remains a theme that is often repeated in the other insertions. Instances of loss or disaster are also associated with portents, as in annal 1107 which notes the accession of Ernulf.¹²¹ In the received entry, this portent was originally associated with the king's arbitrary act of granting ecclesiastical positions. It now becomes dissociated from its earlier context, and the waxing and waning of the moon becomes associated with the tenure of Ernulf, the image gaining greater intensity in the next insertion made at 1114, which records the appointment of Ernulf to the see of Rochester, albeit against his will. The accession of John of Sééz as abbot of Peterborough is also noted in this annal, though it is nowhere specifically mentioned in the E text (as it is in *Hugh Candidus*) that it was during his tenure that the monastery burnt down. The annal closes with the mention of the king sailing to Portsmouth just as the beginning of the extract had noted his delay due to the bad weather, the compiler consciously integrating the later narrative into the earlier text portion.

This consistent mention of natural calamities within a framework of wider events is frequent enough to merit attention, as their recurrent presence indicates that, in retrospect, the inherited text is used to contextualise and add meaning to the Peterborough insertion. The preceding analyses have demonstrated instances where the

other had ever done before him, nor any after him. Then the Golden Borough became the Wretched Borough.'

¹¹⁹ 'A very good man and very wise.'

¹²⁰ As the chronicler notes: 'Syððon comen ealle dræuednysse 7 ealle ifele to þone mynstre. God hit gemytse!' (Since then came all tribulation and all evil to the monastery. May God have mercy on it!)

¹²¹ 'Manege sædon þet hi on þam monan þyses geares mistlice tacna gesawon 7 ongean cynde his leoman wexende 7 waniende' (Many said that they saw various signs in the moon that year, and its light waxing and waning contrary to nature).

compiler seems keenly aware of how accounts of natural disaster or socio-political upheavals could be used to impart depth and intensity to the inserted text. The mention of famine intensifies the narrative of Hereward's raid (1070), and the Norman Conquest (1066) marks a social and political change that finds an equivalence on a local scale in the death of Abbot Leofric. But its most striking manifestation is perhaps in the structuring of annal 1116.

Annal 1116 contains the last of the insertions made before the text was continued at Peterborough from 1122 to its end in 1154. The fire of 1116 is considered to be a major event for the monastery, and may have contributed in part to the flurry of textual activity at Peterborough in the twelfth century. We do know that the fire did not raze the monastery to the ground, as the E text notes that the chapter-house and the dormitory were not burned, and Hugh's text further adds that the privy and the new refectory were also saved. The legends which grew around this incident are narrated by Hugh,¹²² but are not even hinted at in the E text, with the incident meriting only a sparse and laconic mention at the end of the entry for 1116. The annal records, amongst other things, a long and severe winter, tensions between France and Normandy, a year marked by loss of crops and scarcity of animal fodder, and high taxes. These domestic, national and economic crises form the reference frame for the mention of the fire, and impart depth and intensity to the event. A comparison with the corresponding entry in the WA reveals that this narrative is part of the original entry. However, despite the greater portion of it being derived from an earlier stage of textual transmission, the annal as it stands in the E text is resonant with a cumulative intensity enhanced by the formulaic repetition of 'Ðis ... gear' (this year), an intrinsic part of the annalistic framework in the *Chronicle*. The new text is appended to the earlier entry by using the same formulaic phrase, 'On þisum ylcan geare' (In this same year), and the insertion is kept as spare and free from extraneous detail as possible. Indeed, it is the starkness of the narrative that makes this one of the most eloquent statements about the disasters suffered by the abbey.

This analysis of the Peterborough Interpolations not derived from external charter documentation implies that the cumulative contextual intensification of an event cannot be dismissed as accidental, caused merely by the coming together of text portions written at different moments in time. The annals are deliberately structured so as to

¹²² A certain 'sergeant of the bakehouse' called on the Devil to blow the fire when his stove was not lighting. The fire burst out at once and burnt the monastery as, Hugh notes explicitly, was mentioned in the Devil's prophecy to Bishop Æthelric. See Mellows, ed., *Hugh Candidus*, pp. 97–8. This incident, like the raid of Hereward, is linked to the same cause of diabolical intervention.

place two sets of events, the national and the local, in a relationship of difference (as in 1013, where the relic acquisition of Peterborough is placed in the context of Swein's attack on England) or implied similarity (as in annals 1066, 1114 and 1116). In this, the Peterborough compiler is amply supported by the annals in his inherited version, as incidents of famine, high taxes or peculiar portents are particularly frequent in this post-Conquest section of the text. Particularly significant examples are 1083 (noting the Glastonbury dispute between Thurstan and his monks, set in the context of high taxation),¹²³ the Domesday survey *s.a.* 1085 (set in the context of political raids and ravages) followed by an entry (also dated 1085 in E) which notes the bad weather and pestilence amongst crops,¹²⁴ and 1086, which describes how bad a year it was before moving on to an assessment of the Conqueror's character.¹²⁵ Annal 1103 records the death of Abbot Matthew in an annal which also notes the incident of blood welling from the ground in Berkshire. Similar instances are also noted *s.a.* 1098 and 1100, both significantly in connection with obits. Annal 1098 contains the notices of the deaths of Walchelin, bishop of Winchester, Baldwin, abbot of St Edmunds, and Turolde, abbot of Peterborough, more famously mentioned in 1070. Similarly, 1100 records the death of William Rufus during a hunt right after the mention of the Berkshire incident.¹²⁶ This recurrent use of this incident in association with death notices in all three circumstances imbues it with the imaginative associations of a portent.¹²⁷

¹²³ After noting the forced entry of the Norman soldiers into the abbey's chapter, the 'reowlic þing þær gelamp on dæg' ('the terrible thing that happened on the day'; note here the similarity of the annalist's vocabulary with 1086 E), the entry notes the king's harshness: 'on þes ylcan geares æftre midewintre se cyng let beodan mycel gyld 7 hefelic ofer eall Englaland' (in this same year after midwinter the king ordered a great and heavy tax over all England).

¹²⁴ This is noted as 1085^b in Irvine, ed., *MS E*, pp. 94–5: '7 þæs ilcan geares wæs swiðe hefelic gear 7 swiðe swincfull 7 sorhfull gear innan Englelande on orfcwealme, 7 corn 7 wæstmas wæron ætstandene, 7 swa mycel ungelimp on wæderunge' (and this same year was a very heavy year and a very laborious and sorrowful year in England in cattle-disease, and corn and crops were [left] standing, and such mishap with the weather).

¹²⁵ See Irvine, ed., *MS E*, pp. 95–9. Numerous other entries may also be cited as examples, see 1089, 1090, 1095, 1096, 1097, 1098, 1100, 1104, 1105, 1110 and 1111 where similar accounts of high taxes, famine and shortage abound.

¹²⁶ '7 to þam Pentecosten wæs \ge/sewen innan Barrucscire æt anan tune blod weallan of eorþan, swa swa mænige sædan þe hit geseon sceoldan. And þæræfter on morgen æfter hlammæse dæge wearð se cyng Willelm on huntnoðe fram his anan men mid anre fla ofsceoten' (And at Pentecost was seen in a certain town/village in Berkshire blood coming out from the earth, as many said who must have seen in. And thereafter, on the morning after Lammas Day, the king, William, was shot with an arrow by one of his men during hunting).

¹²⁷ For a general discussion of prognostics literature and their presence and significance in various texts see R. M. Liuzza, 'Anglo-Saxon Prognostics in Context: a Survey and Handlist of Manuscripts', *ASE* 30 (2001), 181–230, particularly pp. 190–221, where Liuzza elaborates on 'the private world of monastic preoccupation with times and

This striking correspondence between the structure of the received annals and the Peterborough insertions implies a complex awareness of the received *Chronicle* by the Peterborough compiler. It is logical to infer that the frequent mention of famine, bad weather, high taxes, and cattle and crop mortality, along with certain specific events like the Berkshire incident, justifies their use as *topoi*, images that gain intensity and take on certain associations through their recurrent use in similar contexts. An implicit textual sanction for such use may have existed in the frequent recording of natural disasters and political turmoil in the post-Conquest entries in the received proto-E version. In inserting new text portions in accordance with a received structure, the compiler of the Peterborough text shows a greater awareness of the pre-existent narrative and the form of the *Chronicle* version than has been hitherto perceived.

It remains to be asked whether the Peterborough compiler's awareness of the 'disaster *topoi*' results in a reworking or restructuring of the received entries so as to heighten the impact of his narrative. Given the absence of parallel *Chronicle* versions corresponding to the post-Conquest entries in E, it is more difficult to make a definite assertion for this compiler's structural re-ordering and insertion. However, two entries may indicate an editorial intervention of this nature.

The 1041 annal notes the death of Harthacnut and the popular choice of Edward the Confessor as king, and the death of Abbot Ælfsige and the accession of Earnwig at Peterborough. As in 1066, these national and local events are presented as parallel, and use similar verbs in succession: Harthacnut died ('forðferde'), and the people chose ('folc geceas') the next king, similarly Ælfsige 'forðferde' and 'man ceas' Earnwig. This is punctuated by the statement that it was a year of losses, marked by bad crops and weather, as well as cattle disease.¹²⁸ The Latin entry in the WA for the same year does not correspond to the E text. The other extant *Chronicle* versions also provide no exact correspondence: the A version has a short notice regarding the death of Harthacnut, versions C and D have similar accounts of that period though they do not match E. The only version with an entry similar in phrasing to the E text is F, which notes '7 eal þæt gear was swa hefityme on manegan ðingan swa nan man ær gemunde', in a

seasons, interior movements and exterior portents ... in which "superstitious" practices existed comfortably alongside orthodox religious devotions'.

¹²⁸ '7 eall þæt gear wæs swiðe hefig time on manegum þingum 7 mislicum, ge on unwæderum ge on eorðwæstmum, 7 swa mycel orfes wæs þæs geares forfaren swa nan man ær ne gemunde, ægðer ge þurh mistlice cōða ge þurh ungewyderu.' (And all that year was a very heavy time in many and various things, both in bad weather and in the fruits of the earth, and so many cattle died this year as no man remembered before, either through various diseases or through bad weather.)

phrasing remarkably similar to the annal in the E text.¹²⁹ However, the mention that it was a disastrous year for crops and cattle is peculiar to the E text alone. It is possible that version F summarised from the extended original annal in the proto-E, which is now extant in its current form only in the E text.¹³⁰ However, the lack of any definite evidence regarding such adaptation also leaves open the possibility that the compiler of the E text may have expanded the original entry.¹³¹

The second example is 1103, already noted with reference to the consistent association of the incident of blood welling from the earth with obits of kings and bishops. The entry for that year in the WA provides a close Latin translation of the entry as we have it in E. However there are a few significant differences, as a comparison of the two extracts reveals. After an account of the political situation, the narrative in E continues with a catalogue of disasters and portents.¹³² The Latin entry in the WA also records these incidents, but the incidents are noted in a different order.¹³³ In the WA, the mention of high taxes is followed by the incident of the blood welling from the earth in Berkshire, followed by the mention of the great wind on St

¹²⁹ 'And all that year was so heavy [a] time in many things as no man remembered before.'

¹³⁰ See Irvine, ed., *MS E*, p. lxxi, for a survey of the annals, or parts of annals from 983 to 1043 shared by E and F.

¹³¹ Irvine notes that the Peterborough-specific part of the annal extends into the right hand and bottom margins, which she considers to be sign of later addition, though it may also be an attempt to fit the extended annal into a predetermined space, see Irvine, ed., *MS E*, p. 77.

¹³² 'On þisum geare eac æt Heamstede innan Barrucscire wæs gesewen blod of eorðan. Ðis wæs swiðe gedeo\rfsum gear her on lande þurh mænifealde gylð 7 þurh orfwealm 7 wæstma forweorþenesse, ægðer ge on corne 7 eac on eallon treowwæstman. Eac on morgen upon Sancte Laurentius mæssedæg gedyde se wind swa mycel to hearne her on lande on eallon westman swa nan man ne gemunde þet æfre ænig ær gedyde. On ðisum ylcan geare Mathias abbot of Burh forðferde, se ne lyfode na leng þan an geare syððan \hef abbot wæs: æfter Sancte Michaelæs mæssan on .xii. kalendas Novembris he wæs mid procession underfangen to abbote, 7 on ðam ylcan dæge þes oðres geares he wearð dead on Gleawceastre 7 þær bebyrged' (In this year also at Hampstead in Berkshire was seen blood coming out from the earth. This was an exceedingly grievous year here in this land, because of the manifold taxes, and because of the cattle plague and the failure of crops both in corn and in all the fruits of the trees. Also in the morning upon St. Lawrence's mass day, a wind did so much harm here on the land to the produce as no man remembered that any had ever done before. In the same year Matthew, abbot of Burch died, he did not live longer than a year since he was [made] abbot, after St. Michael's mass on 21 October, he was with procession received as abbot, and on the same day of the next year he was dead in Gloucester and buried there). The interpolated part has been marked out in italics here.

¹³³ 'Eodem anno valde fuit carus in Anglia pro multis geldis, et mortalitate animalium, et pro defectione segetum. Et visus est sanguis ebullire a terra in Berucscyra apud Hamstede. Et primo die post festum Sancti Laurentii fecit ventus tantum damnum, quantum nemo meminit, quod unquam antea fecerat.' (The same year was a very costly one for England, through the many taxes, and animal deaths and the failure of crops. And there was seen blood coming out from the earth at Hampstead in Berkshire. And at the beginning of the day after the feast of Saint Lawrence, a wind made so much damage, as no one remembered any [wind] to have made [to this extent] at any time before this).

Lawrence's day. The E text on the other hand first notes the incident in Berkshire, and the catalogue of disasters culminates in the mention of the great wind. There seems to be a movement from the local and particular (a portent recorded in one particular place, Hampstead, Berkshire), to the social sphere (excessive taxation) and finally to the natural domain (crop and animal mortality, the great wind), the last recorded as unparalleled in human memory. This larger perspective seems to impart intensity and a universal quality to an event which is, after all, solely local in its import – the death of Abbot Matthew.¹³⁴ There remains no absolute proof that the compiler of the E text changed the order of the received entry; in fact, it is all too easy to dismiss this slight difference as a change made by the compiler of the WA. However, given the exact correspondences between the Latin text and E in all other cases, we should also note that this is the only instance where the order of the Latin entry in the WA differs from the corresponding Old English annal, and therefore provides justification for interpreting the differences in the E text as a deliberate attempt at re-emphasis.

Conclusion: Negotiating the text

The close textual analysis in this chapter draws attention to the complex negotiations involved in the construction and integration of the Peterborough Interpolations in the received *Chronicle*, and this provides valuable insight into the way the compiler has ordered and presented the material. The entries derived from charters, leases and diplomas negotiate not just with the received *Chronicle* text, but also with a range of texts in other generic formats that have an alternative existence (for example, the *Relatio Heddae*, the *Liber Niger* and the later house-history by Hugh Candidus). These entries derived from charter material, genuine or forged, are instrumental in inscribing the *locus* of the text, and create a space that is presumed to have a physical existence (in terms of being bounded geographically through a secure wall or by means of charter bounds), but is also symbolic (in being a space that is also part of the past rather than the present). They are also a textual evocation of the rich Anglo-Saxon past of *Medeshamstede* as perceived by the Peterborough chronicler, and narrate a relationship of bounty that is in marked contrast to a land-insecurity ridden post-Conquest scenario. *Medeshamstede* is initially created as a secure

¹³⁴ The cumulative intensity of the annal should be placed in the context of the extra information that we derive from *Hugh Candidus*. The E text does not record the prolonged land suit that the abbey fought against his brother Geoffrey Ridel after the abbot's demise, see Mellows, ed., *Hugh Candidus*, pp. 88–9.

space, physically protected by a wall and secured by royal and papal privileges, but is then gradually eroded away by the changes in rule and political relations, as well as by the raid of Hereward.

The non-diplomatic insertions, though not obviously derived from external sources, are also involved in subtle negotiations with the received entries, which are retained rather than eliminated in the process of recompiling and rewriting the Peterborough text. The received context may function in relationships of similarity (as in 1052, 1066, 1070, 1103 and 1116) or contrast (1013). The recurrent use of the *leitmotif* of disaster also raises the possibility that the compiler may have manipulated the original text so as to enhance the contextual intensification, as perhaps in annals 1103 and 1041. The non-diplomatic interpolations demonstrate the compiler's awareness of the received form, structure and language of the *Chronicle* version used as a base text. For example, short text insertions seem to be appended as seamlessly as possible to the pre-existent entries using the stock connective phrases used elsewhere in the *Chronicle*.¹³⁵ Also striking is the use of pre-existent annals of the base text to intensify the effect of the interpolated narrative. The compiler's keen awareness of the way accounts of natural disaster and socio-political upheavals (bad crops, high taxes and political turmoil) may be used to impart depth and intensity to the inserted text is evident in their recurrent use as *topoi*. Though different in context, in terms of methodology, the compilation of these annals matches the nuanced incorporation of the diplomatic interpolations. Just as the diplomatic entries demonstrate an indebtedness to the form and function of the texts from which they are derived,¹³⁶ as well as a generic awareness of the text into which they have been inserted, the non-diplomatic entries exhibit a thorough grasp of the structure and form of the received *Chronicle* version, and the contextual possibilities of the pre-existent narrative.¹³⁷ This suggests that the *Chronicle* was considered to be authoritative enough so as to be retained in its received form as far as possible, and this implicit awareness is also evident as the text is continued at Peterborough. The significance of this perception of the *Chronicle* by the Peterborough compiler, and the wider implications of a common

¹³⁵ Usually '7 on þis ilcan tyme', or '7 on þisum ilcan geare', as for example in 1052, 1103, 1114 and 1116. This may be compared with similar usage in 1083 or 1085 in the copied annals.

¹³⁶ While the charters are summarised and presented as narrative according to the demands of the annal format, their use of the first person and direct speech (unusual in the *Chronicle*) seems to be sanctioned by the diploma form of the originals on which they are based.

¹³⁷ It is tantalising to infer that the use of elements of the received context as *topoi* may have been motivated by the compiler's familiarity with diplomatic texts. As noted by Gransden, the use of *topoi* was particularly prevalent in the construction of (forged) foundation charters, see Gransden, 'Traditionalism and Continuity', pp. 163–4.

methodology of compilation, will be explored in greater detail in a discussion of the Peterborough Continuations.¹³⁸

By making the Peterborough Interpolations consonant with the style and structure of the received annals, the Peterborough compiler effectively transforms his text. The local references impose a new place of origin on the earlier *Chronicle* text. Such textual re-appropriation is in itself an authoritative gesture, as the text is so transformed as to be rendered incapable of further transmission. In a hypothetical situation, if a new version of the *Chronicle* had to be based on the extant Peterborough text, it would have to be reworked completely if another local identity were to be imposed on it. The Peterborough Interpolations are more than markers of provenance and locality; textually they represent the first step in the appropriation of a text traditionally regarded as a record of national matters. This is commensurate with the increased tendency towards localisation apparent in the transmission of the *Chronicle* versions themselves, and their association with certain monastic centres, most notably Canterbury. In this regard, a close parallel to the construction of the E text at Peterborough is the construction of the F text at Christ Church, Canterbury.¹³⁹

The Peterborough Interpolations also demonstrate significant interaction between Latin and vernacular texts at Peterborough, particularly with respect to the incorporation of alternative generic formats. The incorporation of charter material involves ordering, selection, translation and compilation of material that exists in a different language and generic form. This is a significant feature of the E text (as well as a feature shared by the bilingual F version, as subsequent analysis will reveal), and it raises a number of wider issues that need to be resolved. The first is the level of correspondence between historiography in Latin and the vernacular, not just within a local Peterborough context, but also with respect to contemporary historiography. Many of the twelfth-century Latin historians (certainly John of Worcester, Henry of Huntingdon, Orderic Vitalis and William of Malmesbury) were aware of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* as a legitimate and important source of history, and there are many instances of correspondences between the Latin histories and *Chronicle* versions. However, while editors have diligently noted the extent to which the *Chronicle* is used as source text in terms of content, what has

¹³⁸ These aspects are developed further in the analysis of the narrative of the First Continuation in Chapter 2, pp. 62–81 and in Malasree Home, 'Double-edged déjà vu: the Complexity of the Peterborough Chronicle', in Alice Jorgensen, ed., *Reading the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, Studies in the Early Middle Ages 23 (Turnhout, 2010), pp. 67–90. The similarity of style and structure between the Interpolations and the First Continuation may imply that one person was responsible not just for the scribal copying of the E text till 1132, but also for the process of composition and compilation.

¹³⁹ See Chapter 3, pp. 111–20.

never been explored is the extent to which all historians, the stalwarts as well as the anonymous compilers of the versions of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, may have worked from similar conceptions of historiography, and used similar methods of compilation. The other issue raised is the extent of generic fluidity apparent in the construction of the *Chronicle* versions at Canterbury and Peterborough, particularly in the use of alternative generic formats like charter and diplomatic. There needs to be a deeper analysis of what this hybridity may mean for our ideas of generic boundaries, and these issues will also be addressed in a subsequent chapter.¹⁴⁰

But for the moment, and before we move on to such wider issues of generic constraints and linguistic boundaries, we need to focus on the particular aspect of the *Peterborough Chronicle* that has made it unique amongst the *Chronicle* versions. It remains the only extant example of vernacular historiography which was continued into the second half of the twelfth century at a definite location, and exists as a complete manuscript. As noted earlier, the present state of the only other comparative *Chronicle* text, the F version, means that we have no way of knowing how far it was continued in the twelfth century at Canterbury. The Peterborough Continuations therefore need to be analysed in detail in order to understand the dynamics of text construction at Peterborough, and the way in which the abbey viewed this *Chronicle* text as a continuing vehicle of identity. This forms the subject of the next chapter.

¹⁴⁰ These issues are considered in detail in Chapter 3, pp. 135–41.

Continuing the *Chronicle*

History in motion: the writing of the Peterborough Continuations

The Peterborough Interpolations demonstrate the compiler's awareness of the form, structure and content of the received proto-E *Chronicle* text. This acknowledgment of a textual past co-exists with Peterborough's appropriation of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. This is particularly apparent in the charters, which, transformed as *Chronicle* narrative and associated with a known tradition of vernacular historiography, not only inscribe the geography of the place into the text, but are also used to support Peterborough's ancient claims to authority. This local appropriation is taken a step further by the Continuations, which were written after the compilation of the *Chronicle* till 1121.

Like the Interpolations, both the First and the Second Continuations were written in a form of English which deviated from the standard West Saxon more prevalent in the earlier parts of the *Chronicle*. To Plummer, this presumably 'current' state of the language was an indication that the E text remained a 'living' *Chronicle* and not a mere compilation.¹ Cecily Clark commented on the importance of the First and Second Continuations as evidence of the transitional linguistic stage of Old English towards Middle English, noting that in some cases the First Continuation provided a richer source of information.² Irvine too notes that the language of the Peterborough Continuations is 'early Middle English, distinctly East Midland in dialect'.³ Both scribes show evidence of the transition towards Middle English in their morphology and phonology, with departures from traditional West Saxon usage being more advanced in the case of the Second Continuator. Irvine particularly notes the levelling of unstressed syllables and the overall tendency to reduce inflexions in the Continuations as a whole, while noting that the pronominal system and orthography of both scribal

¹ Plummer, ed., *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel*, II, p. xxxviii.

² Clark, ed., *The Peterborough Chronicle*, p. vii and pp. xlv–lxiii.

³ Irvine, ed., *MS E*, p. ciii.

hands are generally consistent with late West Saxon.⁴ However, a consideration of only the linguistic transition towards Middle English occludes the implications of a change in authorship between the two Continuations. While there may not be a marked difference between the overall linguistic features of the First and Second Continuations, there seem to be significant differences as well as similarities in form and narrative strategy. What in the case of linguistic deviation is merely a difference in degree may well be a difference in kind from the perspective of literary and contextual analysis, and the individuality of the narrative in the two Continuations indicates that the construction of the E text was far from one-dimensional.

As a text compiled from an earlier *Chronicle*, and subsequently continued in two distinct phases till 1154, the *Peterborough Chronicle* is an example of the complex ways in which a text may be compiled, constructed and re-constructed. The copied annals till 1121, which form the major part of the rewritten text, are written as one scribal block, but incorporate a complex level of compilation where new text portions localised at Peterborough (the Interpolations) are meshed in with the pre-existent text. In comparison, the compilation of the First Continuation is simpler; it appears to be written in six blocks at different times, even though its annals cover a period of only ten years, 1122 to 1131.⁵ This is made evident by the changes in ink and the aspect of the writing. There is a noticeable break in annal 1126, a portion of which is written with the next block of annals. The writing of the Second Continuation seems even more straightforward, being written in a single scribal block after the 1150s, and retrospectively composed at around the same time.⁶ The editorial strategies of all stages of the *Peterborough Chronicle*, and their narrative negotiations with the pre-existent portion of the text form the subject of this chapter.

The First Continuation: annals 1121–1131

The annals from 1121 to 1131 may be considered transitional in every sense of the term. Linguistically, they look forward towards the forms and syntax of Middle English, yet retain elements of standard Old English,⁷ exhibiting different lexical choices in comparison to the

⁴ For Irvine's comprehensive survey of the language of the E text see *ibid.*, pp. ciii–clxvi.

⁵ Ker, *Catalogue*, p. 425, no. 346, and Whitelock, *Peterborough Chronicle*, p. 14. The blocks are as follows (i) 1122, (ii) 1123, (iii) 1124, (iv) 1125–1126 lande, fol. 85a, l. 7, (v) 1126 On þes ilces geares –1127, (vi) 1128–1131.

⁶ Possibly around 1154 or 1155, as noted by Whitelock, *Peterborough Chronicle*, p. 31 and Clark, ed., *The Peterborough Chronicle*, pp. xvii and xxv.

⁷ See Bruce Mitchell, 'Syntax and Word-Order in *The Peterborough Chronicle* 1122–1154',

vocabulary of other *Chronicle* versions.⁸ This amalgam of the old and the new is also apparent in the very act of composing and compiling the *Peterborough Chronicle*. On the one hand, the annals of the First Continuation are narratives in their own right, composed at a time and place removed from the original proto-E version which formed the basis of the *Chronicle* at Peterborough. At the same time these annals are also an extension of the *Chronicle*, and need to be consistent in form and format with the received version of the text. In the case of the *Peterborough Chronicle*, we have already noted the careful incorporation of diplomatic in the Interpolations, and the attention paid to the pre-existent narrative in the incorporation of the non-diplomatic Interpolations. This nuanced textual negotiation is continued in the construction and composition of the annals of the First Continuation.

The first gesture made towards the traditional form and structure of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* is the retention of the annal structure; significant indeed, if we consider that annal numbers may have been erased in the A version at Canterbury to incorporate the *Acta Lanfranci*.⁹ The First Continuation even seems to be compiled in the traditional style, with the annals being copied at frequent intervals, sometimes annually. This is borne out by the fact that the annals are written down in blocks, which usually tend to coincide with the conclusion of an annal entry.¹⁰ The only exception to this rule is the noticeable break in 1126, a part of which is written as the next scribal block containing annal 1127. But 1126 may have been originally conceived as a complete entry for that year, before text was appended as part of the next scribal block, as the annalist notes that King David of Scotland stayed in England for the whole year. The contemporary composition of the annals is also hinted at by the decided inability to foresee how events would go for the monastery,¹¹ and the First Continuation actually demonstrates the features of active chronicling attributed to the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* as a whole, but seldom maintained quite so scrupulously as the various *Chronicle* versions were re-copied and re-compiled. This is also in marked contrast to the way the Second Continuation is copied in one block, possibly around 1154–55. Even though this phase of the Peterborough text nominally follows the annal structure, the narrative follows thematic strands rather than

Neuphilologische Mitteilungen 65 (1964), 113–44. Irvine, ed., *MS E*, p. civ, further notes that the orthography followed by the scribes is essentially that of standard late West Saxon.

⁸ See Irvine, ed., *MS E*, pp. clxiii–clxvi.

⁹ See Introduction, pp. 11–12.

¹⁰ Clark, ed., *The Peterborough Chronicle*, p. xxv. Also see Irvine, ed., *MS E*, pp. xviii–xix.

¹¹ Clark, ed., *The Peterborough Chronicle*, p. xxv, especially with regard to Abbot Henry's future association with Peterborough. Clark notes this lack of foresight as proof of contemporary composition of the annals: 'in 1123 Henry of Angély is introduced as a defender of monastic interests, without a hint of what he was later to mean for Peterborough. At this point the *Chronicle* is being composed before our eyes.'

the strictures of chronological progression, which also argues for composition as a single unit.¹²

Though the compilation of the Peterborough text took place in distinct phases, it is logical to assume that all stages were bound by a commonality of interest, if not by similar principles of construction and compilation. There is also the weight of a pre-existent textual tradition, as represented by the proto-E version of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, and the principles of vernacular historiography that it represents. The key to understanding the way in which the First Continuation is constructed therefore lies not just in its own narrative, but also the way in which it interacts with the received structure, and the writing of the interpolated text.

The old and the new: structural echoes

The First Continuation shows an awareness of the form and structure of the received text in the retention of the annal format, and also in the way the narrative is ordered. All the annals of the First Continuation begin with an indication of where the king's court was held that year, barring 1130 and 1131, which incorporate this information later in the annal. This mention of the royal court is certainly not striking as far as the information is concerned, as some of these notices are also shared in Henry of Huntingdon's *Historia Anglorum* and *The Chronicle of John of Worcester*.¹³ There are also such mentions in the other annals of the *Chronicle*, and it should be noted here that, from annal 1091, most of the annals in the *Peterborough Chronicle* start with the notice of the king's whereabouts during that year, forming a framework within which other events are noted.¹⁴ These annals belong not to the text written at Peterborough but to the proto-E text. Close reading also reveals a subtle difference between the annals which were originally part of the proto-E, and those of the First Continuation, even though they all seem to start the entry in a similar manner. The annals of the received version that commence by mentioning the king's whereabouts note, as a rule, further details about the king's political movements. To take an example, the entry for 1094 in the E text mentions that William Rufus held his court at Gloucester during Christmas. But it further notes that it was to that court that Robert of Normandy sent

¹² *Ibid.*, pp. xxv–xxvi, for the observation that these annals seem to be arranged topic by topic. This and other aspects of the Second Continuation will be discussed in greater detail below, see pp. 81–100.

¹³ The relationship between the *Peterborough Chronicle* and Latin historiography is discussed further in Chapter 3, pp. 120–34.

¹⁴ These royal movements are also noted by John of Worcester and Henry of Huntingdon. McGurk also notes that such information appears only in *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, see McGurk, ed., *The Chronicle of John of Worcester*, Vol. III, p. xxiii.

an ambassador renouncing the covenant earlier sworn between them. The entry then goes on to mention the king's further movements as well as other political and ecclesiastical affairs, and they are noted as part of the causal progression of the annal narrative. Annals 1096, 1105, 1111 and 1114 also demonstrate a similar pattern. Annal 1111 opens its narrative by stating that the king did not hold his court that year, but involved himself with his continental affairs.¹⁵ This shows the beginnings of a narrative convention, one perfected in due course by the Peterborough chronicler.

Even though the mention of the king's whereabouts seems to form the framework of the annals of the First Continuation, a closer investigation reveals it to be superficial. Annal 1122, for example, mentions that King Henry was in Norwich, after which it notes the burning of Gloucester in the 'preceding year'. Likewise, annal 1123 notes the king's presence at Dunstable during Christmas, but notes the king's further whereabouts only to use it as a pretext for narrating in dramatic detail the sudden death of Bishop Robert Bloet of Lincoln.¹⁶ It therefore appears that the mention of the king's whereabouts is used by the compiler of the First Continuation merely as a structural formula, not necessarily essential for narrative progression.¹⁷ It is also reasonable to posit that this convention was adopted simply because eleventh- and twelfth-century annals in the received *Chronicle* frequently commence in this manner. This system of structural echoes in the First Continuation has a narrative parallel in the use of the inherited context as a mode of intensification in the Interpolations. The preceding chapter has already drawn attention to the Peterborough compiler's use of pre-existent narrative while incorporating interpolated text, and the way in which it is seamlessly integrated with the later narrative. The frequent mentions of famine, crop failure and natural disasters function as *topoi*, and serve to contextualise, intensify or nuance the interpolated narrative.¹⁸ As a structural formula, this mention of the king's whereabouts also obscures the fact that the First Continuation was compiled at a different time and place, thus facilitating the joining of new text to the inherited *Chronicle* version. While the manuscript evidence clearly indicates that the First Continuation was written after the compilation of the text till 1121,¹⁹ its structure endeavours to hide the fact by invoking a superficial continuity with the received text, thus emphasising its textual status as a continuation, rather than a departure.

¹⁵ See Irvine, ed., *MS E*, p. 109.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 122.

¹⁷ This idea is developed further in my study of the narrative mechanisms of the First Peterborough Continuator, see Home, 'Double-edged déjà vu', pp. 67–90.

¹⁸ See Chapter 1, pp. 52–7.

¹⁹ Irvine, ed., *MS E*, pp. xviii–xxiii.

Words, words, words

Just as the structure of the First Continuation consciously allies itself with the pre-existent text, the content also demonstrates complex correlations in language and narrative strategy. The recurrent use of words related to acts of speech, writing and inscription in order to validate the grants made by Anglo-Saxon kings in the Interpolations has already been discussed in detail. The Interpolations drawing on diplomatic texts also emphasise the authority and freedom granted to *Medeshamstede* through the use of the adverbs 'swa kynlice 7 swa freolice', and further by the consistent use of the word 'onsting' (authority). The only exception is the grant of King Edgar noted *s.a.* 963, which uses the more general terms 'freodom' and 'freolice' along with 'hæse' (command) in a similar construction.²⁰ The Bull of Pope Vitalian summarised after Wulfhere's grant accedes 'þet ne kyning ne man ne haue nan onsting buton þon abbot ane', and the Bull of Pope Agatho *s.a.* 675 also commands in similar phraseology, 'þet ne kyning ne biscop ne eorl ne 'n'an man ne haue nan onsting'. The phrase also occurs in the grant of the monastery of Woking noted *s.a.* 777,²¹ derived from genuine documentation, and a form of this charter also appears on folio 41 of the *Liber Niger*.²² The word 'onsting' seems to have had specific legal connotations, and most citations of the word seem to be from writs.²³ The consistent use of this word demonstrates the compiler's awareness of the impact of legal linguistic registers in imparting authority to the narrative.

A similar strategy in the use of linguistic registers may be observed in the way the narrative of the First Continuation contextualises the word 'wurðscipe'. It first appears in 1125, in the narrative of the visit of John of Crema. The pomp and ceremony of his reception in England is built up through *polysyndeton* and parallel clauses, but culminates in the terse comment that he was unable to enforce laws regarding ecclesiastical conduct, 'þa ilce lagas þa Anselm ærcebiscop

²⁰ 'þet ne king ne biscop ne eorl ne sc<i>reue ne haue þær nane hæse, ne nan man buton se abbot ane.' (That neither king nor bishop nor earl nor shire-reeve may have there any command, nor any one except the abbot alone).

²¹ '7 seo kyning freode þa þet mynstre Wocingas wið cining 7 wið biscop 7 wið eorl 7 wið ealle men swa þet nan man ne hæfde þær nan onsting buton Sancte Peter 7 þone abbot' (And the king then freed that minster from king and from bishop and from earl and from all men, so that no man may have there any authority except Saint Peter and the abbot). Also see Irvine, ed., *MS E*, p. 40.

²² See Kelly, ed., *Charters of Peterborough Abbey*, pp. 198–202.

²³ Based on searches in the Old English Corpus and *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*. The Old English Corpus may be found at <http://ets.umd.umich.edu/o/oec/> (accessed 22 January 2014). See also J. Bosworth, and T. N. Toller, eds., *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* (London, 1973). In the E text and a gloss in *The Rule of St Benet* (H. Logeman, ed., *The Rule of St Benet*, EETS OS 90 (London, repr. 1973), p. 115), it also appears in the verbal form *onstingð*.

hæfde æror geboden'.²⁴ The cumulative effect of the honour is shown to be empty and ineffectual, despite the repetition of the phrase 'underfangen mid wurðscipe'. The subtle denouement of the narrative of the Peterborough text may be contrasted with the bathetic account of John of Crema's visit by Henry of Huntingdon, where the cardinal is caught in the act with a whore, after criticising married priests.²⁵ Annal 1128 associates this phrase with the false Crusade led by Hugh de Payns. Despite the honour that was done to him (the phrase used is 'underfeng mid wurðscipe', and is reminiscent of John of Crema's visit), and his accumulation of treasure (note also, in this context, the great and splendid gifts given to John of Crema), the people who follow him are misled. Given the frequent contextualisation of this phrase, there are reasons to believe that it should not be taken at face value. The word 'wurðscipe', most commonly used to denote 'honour' or 'respect' is, despite its positive connotations, placed in the context of failure when associated with John of Crema and Hugh de Payns. The other time this phrase occurs is in annal 1130, and associated with the visit of Peter the Venerable from Cluny, and the treacherous promise made by Peterborough's Abbot Henry to make the abbey subject to Cluny.²⁶ Despite the original positive connotations of the word or its associated phrases, 'wurðscipe' is almost always associated with an implicitly critical narrative stance. Through recurrent use, the word or phrase ceases to function as a measure of the worth of the person with whom it is associated.²⁷

²⁴ 'He com first to þone king on Normandi, 7 se king hine underfeng mid micel wurðscipe; betehte hine siððon þone ærceþiscop Willelm of Cantwarabyrig, ... 7 he wæs þær underfangen mid micel wurðscipe 7 mid micel processionem ... 7 siððon he ferde over eall Englalande to ealle þa biscoprices 7 abbotrices þa wæron on þis lande, 7 ofer eall he wæs underfangen mid wurðscipe, 7 ealle hine iæfen micelle gife 7 mære.' (He came first to the king in Normandy, and the king received him with great honour and after that commended him to the Archbishop William of Canterbury ... and he was there received with great honour and with great procession ... And after that he journeyed all over England, to all the bishoprics and abbacies which were in this land, and in all he was received with great honour, and all gave him great and splendid gifts.)

²⁵ Being a married priest himself, Henry has the last laugh, see Greenway, ed., *Henry of Huntingdon: Historia Anglorum*, pp. 473–5.

²⁶ 'Æfter him com se abbot [of] Clunni, Petrus gehaten, to Englelande bi þes kynges leue, 7 wæs underfangen ouer eall swa hwar swa he com mid mycel wurðscipe. To Burch he com, 7 þær behet se abbot Heanri him þet he scolde beieton him þone mynstre of Burch þet hit scolde beon underðed into Clunni' (After him [i.e. Abbot Henry] came the abbot of Cluny, called Peter, to England, by the king's leave, and was received wheresoever he came with great honour. He came to Burch, and there Abbot Henry promised him that he would acquire the monastery of Burch, so that it would be subservient to Cluny). The use of the phrase in 1126, where King Henry received King David of Scotland 'with great honour', is also problematised, especially if, as the E text implies, David suggested the imprisonment of Robert of Normandy.

²⁷ This ironic use of the phrase may be contrasted with its use by the Second Continuator, where it becomes part of the vocabulary of praise for Henry II in 1140. In 1154 this phrase is further used in a conscious parallel between the consecration of the king in London and a new abbot at Peterborough, see below, pp. 91–2.

The most striking use of verbal echoes and registers lies in the narrative of relations between Peterborough abbey and royalty. The Peterborough Interpolations paint a striking picture of royal patronage and generosity, and close relationships between kings and bishops. In the Grant of Wulfhere, 'luve' (love) and its variant forms are repeatedly used to emphasise the relationship of bounty between the monastic founders of the abbey and the Anglo-Saxon royal dynasty, and it is this ideal relationship that guarantees the special privileges claimed to be enjoyed by *Medeshamstede*.²⁸ When the words appear again in annal 1123 in the First Continuation, it is in a radically changed context. The chronicler makes it apparent that the arbitrariness of the election of the archbishop of Canterbury is more due to personal whims than the principles of ecclesiastical election:²⁹

hit wæs togeanes riht þæt man scolde setten clerc ofer muneces ... ac se king hit nolde undon, for þes biscopes luuen of Særesbyrig.³⁰

The phrase becomes an indicator of the political relationships between the king and the bishops; the king's 'love' of the bishop of Salisbury works to the detriment of the proper functioning of ecclesiastical law. Later in the same annal the king grants the bishopric of Lincoln to Alexander, the nephew of the bishop of Salisbury, then a secular cleric 'for þes biscopes luuen'. This echo of phrases used in the interpolations seems to have an ironic effect, serving to emphasise not the bounty of royal grants, but the opposite, the absence of proper ecclesiastical procedure and a dislike of monastic rule, 'forði þæt næfre ne luueden hi munece regol'.³¹ The changing context becomes a measure of the change in relations – from marking the ideal relation of bounty in the narrative of royal grants, the word 'luve' degenerates to become a measure of sycophancy.

The narratives of the Interpolations and the First Continuation seem to interact through parallels and contrasts, adding multiple layers of meaning to the text, and a final point needs to be made before we consider the implications of this correlation. The use of disastrous

²⁸ 'On his time wæx þæt abbodrice Medeshamstede swiðe rice þæt his br[o]ðor hafde ongunnen. Ða luuede se kining hit swiðe for his broðer luuen Peada, 7 for his wedbroðeres luuen Oswi, 7 for Saxulfes luuen þes abbodes' (During his time the abbey of *Medeshamstede*, that his brother had begun, grew very rich. Then the king loved it greatly, for the love of his brother Peada, and for the love of his pledge-brother Oswy, and on account of his love for Seaxwulf the abbot). See Chapter 1, pp. 30–6 for a detailed discussion of the Grant of Wulfhere.

²⁹ This arbitrariness is heightened by the king's appointment of the queen's chancellor Godfrey as the bishop of Bath while the 'new' archbishop was on a visit to Rome.

³⁰ '[I]t was against the law that a clerk should be set over monks, but the king would not change it, on account of [his] love for the bishop of Salisbury.'

³¹ 'because they never liked monastic rule.'

events in pre-existent text as *topoi* to intensify the interpolated narrative has already been noted in the previous chapter, and has also been referred to in the discussion above. Significant examples are 1066 (where the political and social change implied by the Norman Conquest intensifies Peterborough's loss caused by the death of Abbot Leofric) and annal 1070 (where the raid of Hereward on Peterborough abbey is set within a context of political crises and famine). In 1107, the Peterborough notice of Abbot Ernulf's succession to the abbey is inserted not at the end of a pre-existing entry, but in the middle, so as to place it within the narrative of the king's distribution of abbacies in England and in Normandy; and in 1116, the burning of Peterborough abbey gains a cumulative intensity by being placed within the framework of ravage, famine, crop failure and the loss of livestock.

The annals of the First Continuation echo the interpolations in their incorporation of portents within the narrative.³² Annal 1122 juxtaposes the burning of Gloucester with portents, great winds and earthquakes, a structure reminiscent of 1116. In fact, two incidents of fire seem to contain the events, the fire at Gloucester and the 'fir micel 7 brad' seen in the sky.³³ Also using a similar strategy is 1132, the final annal of the First Continuation, which makes a link through context and parallel structure between the change and deterioration of Peterborough abbey and the natural disasters besetting the country. The narrative of ecclesiastical elections (and the absence of proper ecclesiastical policy) in 1123 is followed by an account of the burning of the town of Lincoln. Similarly, the obits of Peterborough abbots are frequently associated with natural disasters; the interpolations made in the copied annals 1041 and 1103 record the deaths of Abbot Ælfsige and Abbot Matthew of Peterborough respectively, both being associated with crop failure and the death of cattle. Annal 1124 in the First Continuation notes the death of Ernulf, bishop of Rochester and former abbot of Peterborough, in exactly the same context, while 1125 records the death of Abbot John of Peterborough along with a great flood which causes great loss to crops, cattle and systems of communication. The death of Ralph, archbishop of Canterbury, noted in 1122 is associated with portents like fire in the earth and sky, and in 1103 it is possible that the

³² See the discussion of portents in the received portion of the text, above in Chapter 1, pp. 52–7. Also see Chapter 4, pp. 159–68, for the way in which this element in the E text compares with the emphasis on the miraculous in *The Chronicle of Hugh Candidus*.

³³ This internal parallelism between these two sections of the annal supports the theory that the mention of the king's whereabouts is tagged onto these entries; see above, pp. 64–5. A similar event is discussed in annal 1131. The mention of such incidents in the Peterborough text may have implications for our perception of the writing of the First Continuation, and its links with a wider corpus of Latin historiography; see Susan Irvine, 'The Production of the Peterborough Chronicle', in Alice Jorgensen, ed., *Reading the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, Studies in the Early Middle Ages 23 (Turnhout 2010), pp. 49–66, particularly pp. 62–3.

mention of blood welling out of the earth in Berkshire in the obit of Abbot Matthew is treated as a portent, given its recurrent associations with death in 1098 and 1100. The appointment of Henry of Saint-Jean-d'Angély as abbot of Peterborough is ominously associated with the sighting of strange black riders on black horses, and the interpolation noting Ernulf's accession to Peterborough in 1107 becomes associated with the waxing and waning of the moon, a particularly apt image of his tenure.

This accretion of meaning and emphasis through context becomes a way of imparting a subjective style to the narrative. There are certainly other instances of 'subjective' narrative in the *Chronicle* text: the annals of the reign of Æthelred the Unready, for example, come across as the work of an individual with a particular viewpoint,³⁴ and the annalist of 1086 E gives an account of the Conqueror with distinct homiletic overtones.³⁵ The frequent use of direct speech in dramatically recreating an event is a device most apparent in the incorporation of diplomatic in the interpolations. It also occurs in the First Continuation, in 1123, for example, where Robert Bloet speaks his last dying words. Events are recreated in a dramatic manner even in narratives which do not ostensibly use direct speech, and demonstrate a gift for storytelling. The swift movements of Hereward's men raiding the abbey in annal 1070 are created through *asyndeton*, as is the expulsion of Abbot Henry from Saint-Jean-d'Angély in 1131. Sometimes motives and intentions are presented through reported speech:³⁶ Hereward's justification for raiding the abbey is presented in such a manner, they 'said that they did it on account of their allegiance to the monastery',³⁷ and Abbot Henry's convoluted arguments are also presented similarly, demonstrating a subtle grasp of motive and causation.³⁸

The narrative of the First Continuation is also peppered with exclamations, proverbs and prayers. Accounts of famine, scarcity and crop failure, while contextually used to intensify the narrative, are also noted in direct layman's terms, in the language of currency transactions. In annal 1124, the chronicler notes the failures of crops, along with rising prices, and buttresses the narrative with exclamatory statements which accelerate with the coming of Abbot Henry from Saint-Jean-d'Angély to Peterborough. These exclamations are also structurally similar to those used frequently in the Interpolations,

³⁴ See Keynes, 'The Declining Reputation of King Æthelred the Unready', pp. 227–53.

³⁵ See Home, "'These things we have written about him': the Portrait of King William in 'The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle' 1086E", particularly pp. 241–50.

³⁶ *Oratio obliqua* as opposed to the *oratio recta* noted by Clark in annal 1123. Reported speech may also be used as a mode of description, as in the account of the Wild Hunt in 1127, see below, pp. 78–80.

³⁷ 'sægdon þet hi hit dyden for ðes mynstres heoldscipe'.

³⁸ See below, pp. 76–8.

particularly in the narrative of Peterborough disasters. However, while the exclamations of the First Continuator have relevance in his current political climate, and with respect to the challenges faced by Peterborough abbey, those in the Interpolations seem out of place and excessively rhetorical, more so as they narrate their contents in retrospect.³⁹ These exclamations need to be seen not as an indicator of narratorial involvement, but as a structural join. They draw attention to the apparent immediacy of the narrative in the Interpolations, and thus hide the fact that these text portions were written at a later date. They seem to imply the chronicler's direct association with the narrated events, and an air of actual involvement (which, of course, does not exist). They operate on various levels in the text, imparting immediacy to the interpolated narrative, but, at the same time, because of their consistent and repeated use, a structural similarity and parallel between the Interpolations and the First Continuation is stressed. As a strategy, this is again similar to the use of notices of royal meetings as a structural formula in the First Continuation.

The parallels in structure with the proto-E text, and the common narrative strategies used in the Interpolations and First Continuation, point towards a closer association between the first two phases of the construction of the Peterborough text than has been hitherto perceived. The analysis of the narrative of the Interpolations and the First Continuation, along with the compilation strategies of the two phases, implies a remarkable consonance in style and structure. This may certainly indicate a very close and seamless working relationship between the compilers of the two phases, but may also indicate something far more significant.

At this stage, before we move on to a consideration of the compilation strategies involved in the construction of the text at Peterborough, some terms need to be clarified. The 'author' of a text (the person who composes the material) may in some cases be different from the 'compiler' of the text, who may have more of an editorial function. However, given the way in which new material (the Interpolations and the First Continuation) is composed with reference to the form, structure and language of the proto-E text, and then seamlessly integrated into the pre-existent narrative of the *Chronicle* version obtained, the terms 'author' and 'compiler' have been used interchangeably here.⁴⁰ As the analysis of the First Continuation and the Interpolations makes apparent, the authorial and editorial

³⁹ As Clark notes, 'In 1066 and 1070, however, the exclamations ... although very like the Continuator's prayers, hardly seem appropriate for work composed fifty years after the event', see Clark, ed., *The Peterborough Chronicle*, p. lxxxiii.

⁴⁰ For an analysis of these editorial and authorial functions, see Chapter 3, pp. 101–5.

functions are very closely intertwined in the case of the Peterborough text, and it seems logical to presume that both functions were performed by the same individual. The functions of the 'author' and 'compiler' are different from that of the 'scribe' or the hand (or hands) writing the actual manuscript, and the next section focuses on the overlap of these functions in the Peterborough text.

The making of the text

The first (and simplest) possible scenario that we may have for the construction of the *Peterborough Chronicle* is as follows: the Interpolations are composed and compiled by an author/compiler and written as a complete unit by the scribe; likewise the First Continuation is composed and compiled in phases, and written down in the manuscript by the scribe. However, as I have already argued in an earlier study, the remarkable structural, formal, linguistic and narrative consonance between the Interpolations and the First Continuation may imply much more than just a good working relationship between the compilers of these phases. To summarise that argument here, the formal and stylistic correspondences between the two phases (the use of structural formulas, contextual linguistic registers and the disaster *topoi*) indicate the presence of a single mind behind the first two phases of the Peterborough text (Interpolations and First Continuation), responsible for both authoring the text and compiling it.⁴¹ This idea of a single author/compiler is further supported by the deep awareness of the traditions of the pre-existent text in both the Interpolations and the First Continuation, and the nuanced way in which the narrative is structured. Besides a single author/compiler being responsible for the Peterborough text till 1131, there is the further possibility that the scribal activity was inextricably linked to the compilation process. It is significant that the scribal strategies of the two phases also match and parallel the compilatory procedures. The first phase of the text is written in a single scribal stint demonstrating a phase of the text where the authorial and compilatory functions resulted in prior integration of new text into the fabric of the proto-E narrative. On the other hand, the second phase shows scribal activity in blocks, also matched by the contemporary composition of the annal narrative in stages. This implies that not only were the first two phases of the text the work of the same author and compiler, as demonstrated by internal correspondences

⁴¹ See Home, 'Double-edged déjà vu', particularly pp. 85–90. This possibility, however, was not totally eliminated by Clark: 'How much apart from the First Continuation this writer may have contributed to the *Chronicle* we cannot say. Some of the Interpolations seem to reflect his manner, especially that at 1070, with its lively account of Hereward's raid on Peterborough', see Clark, ed., *The Peterborough Chronicle*, p. lxxxii.

in structure, style and narrative, but that it is also highly likely that this individual can be identified as the first hand of the manuscript of the *Peterborough Chronicle*. It is also significant that the activities of the main scribe and the First Continuator stop simultaneously, which need not necessarily have been the case if the scribe was separate from the author/compiler. When the compilation of the E text is resumed, there is a new scribe along with a new chronicler.

This idea of a single author/compiler/scribe being responsible for a major part of the text's production in the twelfth century has important implications for how we view the narrative concerns of the First Continuation and the Peterborough text as a whole. We can see this scribe-compiler as someone who was extremely aware of the richness of the vernacular historiographical tradition. As the survey of the Interpolations and the First Continuation reveals, the Peterborough compiler is particularly conscious of the style and format of the proto-E version, and the new text is not only formally consistent with the received tradition, but also uses the pre-existent narrative context further to intensify the narrative. Significant too is the use of similar stylistic and formal strategies in the Interpolations and the First Continuation, for example the use of *topoi* and linguistic registers.

The construction of the text at Peterborough abbey is thus a landmark in the growth and development of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* as a whole. This is not only because it was continued at this point of time in the twelfth century in the vernacular, but because it indicates an awareness of an earlier historiographical and textual tradition, as well as a radical reworking of that tradition. For, despite the compiler's awareness of the text's pedigree, and his frequent nods towards its traditional nature, he intervenes enough to change the structure and genre of this version of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. The conscious need to assert and glorify monastic identity in the post-Conquest scenario leads to the incorporation of charter material, and the way in which this, and origin legends, are incorporated and validated as narrative is indeed a measure of this compiler's prowess. Far from a crude insertion of external documentation, the Peterborough compiler imbues the diplomatic with a degree of internal validity, granting these documents authority through narrative means.

Most importantly, what this notion of a single compiler/scribe indicates is that, though incorporated separately as two distinct phases in the text's construction, the Interpolations and the First Continuation are conceived of as parts of a whole, linked through style, language, narrative strategy and, of course, a common purpose. It is the authorial intent of a single compiler that leads the narrative of the First Continuation to focus on two main (and linked) issues. One is the issue of monastic rights and royal patronage, and the other is the survival of the abbey against all odds (or at least the hope of it).

These concerns, and their ideological links with the earlier phase of the text, thus need to be further analysed.

Monks and their affairs

While considering the merits of the E text as a 'living' *Chronicle*, Plummer remained dismissive about the merits of its later continuations, which is rather ironic given that, strictly speaking, the First Continuation is the only current chronicling activity at Peterborough.⁴² This contemporary perspective is reflected in the ecclesiastical bias of the narrative for, even though the annals start with the whereabouts of the king, his politico-geographical movements are less important than his involvement in the network of ecclesiastical appointments. The immediacy of the narrative has merited some praise by Clark:

One of its best passages is the account of the 1123 archiepiscopal election, with all the manoeuvrings of the ecclesiastical politicians; William of Malmesbury's verdict may be maturer, but the *Chronicle*, rivalled in this only by Hugh the Chantor, more freshly conveys the movements of the intrigue.⁴³

The annal in question records, at its start, the death of Robert Bloet. The narrative is dramatic in its suddenness; the sudden lapse into direct speech marks it out from the rest of the narrative. Clark comments that this account is similar to other parallel records, but the E text 'is alone in offering, in a piece of *oratio recta* unusual for the *Chronicle*, what purports to be the dying bishop's *ipsissima verba*: "Laferd kyng, ic swelte"'. She simultaneously notes that 'Bloet would not have spoken in English',⁴⁴ while John of Worcester notes explicitly that the bishop was 'struck dumb'.⁴⁵ This use of direct speech in a predominantly third person narrative is rare in the *Chronicle* as a whole, but not unusual, as we have seen, in the Interpolations. In the charter entries, the original diploma is effectively compressed by presenting portions of the grant as part of a royal speech, and this draws attention to the speech act as a system of validation, further revalidated by written

⁴² 'We need not therefore discuss the sources of these annals ... The monastic chroniclers, from time to time, recorded such current events as came to their knowledge, and were deemed sufficiently important to be entered in the *Chronicle* of their house.' See Plummer, ed., *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel*, II, pp. xlvii–xlvi.

⁴³ Clark, ed., *The Peterborough Chronicle*, p. xxxiv.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*

⁴⁵ 'Rotbertus .xviii. Lincoliensis episcopus, mense Ianuario, dum apud Wudestoke, equo sedens, cum Henrico colloquium haberet, subito decidere cepit et ommutit' (In January at Woodstock, Robert, the eighteenth bishop of Lincoln, was riding, and conversing with King Henry, when he fell suddenly and was struck dumb). See McGurk, ed., *The Chronicle of John of Worcester*, Vol. III, pp. 152–3.

documentation.⁴⁶ Direct speech in annal 1123, however, seems to be incorporated for dramatic effect only. It should also be noted here that this use of reconstructed dialogue belongs more to the genre of Latin historical writing, and Henry of Huntingdon, Eadmer and Orderic Vitalis (to note just a few) make frequent use of it.⁴⁷ A marker of the E text in its 'late' stages is this resemblance to Latin texts, and these correspondences with texts belonging to different genres and their implications are discussed later.⁴⁸

The narrative in 1123 moves over to the process of choosing the archbishop of Canterbury, the rapidity of the events following one after the other being buttressed by the use of parallel clauses.⁴⁹ This, as has been noted earlier, is a consistent mode of imbuing the narrative with immediacy, the classic example of this being the narrative of the founding of the abbey, where this strategy effectively occludes the fact that there was a significant lapse of time between the inception of a monastic structure and the date of its actual consecration.⁵⁰ The recurrent use of *polysyndeton* brings the entire ecclesiastical circle in England under the power of the king's 'writ', and balances the speed of narrative progression. The use of the same verb of volition links the will of the bishops ('swa hwam swa swa hi woldon') to the king's validation ('7 he him wolde tyþian'), and the rapid progression of the narrative conveys the chronicler's awareness of the change brought about by new ecclesiastical factions. The consistent opposition of 'munuc' to 'clerc' clearly indicates this chronicler's allegiances; nevertheless, the insistence of the new generation of bishops that they wanted a man from the secular clergy chosen as archbishop is too powerful to be resisted by the adherents of the old monastic order.⁵¹

This realistic evaluation of the ecclesiastical climate is far removed from the claim made in the Interpolations that the abbey was founded as a monastic institution from the very beginning, and remained so

⁴⁶ For the use of speech verbs in the grant of King Wulfhere, see Chapter 1, pp. 34–5.

⁴⁷ Clark, ed., *The Peterborough Chronicle*, pp. xxix–xxx.

⁴⁸ For example, as noted earlier, the use of the first person narrative in the charter entries may be derived from their 'original' diploma form, and parallel usage may also be seen in the incorporation of diplomatic texts in the bilingual F text. Chapter 3 considers in more detail issues of generic identity and boundaries (pp. 135–42), and the possibility of vernacular and Latin texts drawing on common sources of information (pp. 128–34).

⁴⁹ See Irvine, ed., *MS E*, pp. 122–4.

⁵⁰ See Chapter 1, pp. 30–2.

⁵¹ 'And se prior 7 se munecas of Canwarabyrig 7 ealle þa oðre þe ðær wæron munechades men hit wiðcwæðen fulle twa dagas, as hit naht ne beheld, for se biscop of Særesbyrig wæs strang 7 wealde eall Engleland 7 wæs þærtogeanes eall þet he mihte 7 cuðe' (And the prior and the monks of Canterbury and all the other men of monastic rule who were there withstood it for two full days, but it was not to any avail, for the bishop of Salisbury was powerful and ruled all England, and was opposed to it with all his might and openly).

over time, a claim prompted more by historical nostalgia than fact.⁵² The chronicler's evocation of an ideal Anglo-Saxon past becomes all the more poignant in the light of the current political climate. It has perhaps not been realised how close in time to the Interpolations the First Continuation may have been written. If the E text to 1121 was compiled after the fire of 1116, the Interpolations would have been inserted within the span of only five years, 1116–1121, perhaps even towards the latter end of this short span, which is when the First Continuation starts to be maintained. The evocation of a 'monastic' past in the interpolated text therefore seems to have been a deliberate counterpoint to the mounting ecclesiastical crises of the 1120s, and further indicates a common authorial intent in the writing of the Interpolations and the First Continuation.

The changed values are reflected by a changed narrative tone. The new archbishop of Canterbury is, in due course, received in Rome, and, despite initial recalcitrance, the pope ultimately gives his blessing because 'þet ofercom Rome þet ofercumeð eall weoruld – þet is gold 7 seolure'.⁵³ This mention of the venality of Rome is not a feature of this text alone: Eadmer notes it, and Hugh the Chanter mentions bribery in his partisan account of the primacy dispute.⁵⁴ Nevertheless, it becomes a marker of the increasingly cynical, worldly-wise tone of the compiler of the First Continuation, which becomes darker and grimmer in the account of Henry of Saint-Jean-d'Angély.

Henry of Saint-Jean-d'Angély and the trials of Peterborough abbey

The death of Abbot John *s.a.* 1125 marks the entry of Henry of Saint-Jean-d'Angély into Peterborough. The king's arbitrary allocation of ecclesiastical offices *s.a.* 1123 sets the tone for the allocation of Peterborough to Henry *s.a.* 1127, who convinces the king that he does not, in actuality, hold the abbacy of Saint-Jean-d'Angély. His career is then recorded in great detail by the chronicler, and Abbot Henry's designs in trying to get a foothold in England ('þa beþohte he him þet gif he mihte ben rotfest on Engleland þet he mihte habben \e/al his wille') are firmly indicated.⁵⁵ The subtle narrative strategies of this part of the text have not gone unnoticed by Clark:

⁵² This emphasis on monastic continuity may be compared with the more radical presentation of history by the F compiler discussed in Chapter 3, pp. 116–17.

⁵³ 'what overcame Rome was that which overcome all the world, that is gold and silver'.

⁵⁴ Clark, ed., *The Peterborough Chronicle*, p. 97, n. 62.

⁵⁵ 'He wæs on his clærchade biscop on Scesscuns; siððan warð he munec on Clunni 7 siððon prior on þone seolue minstre, 7 siððon he wærð prior on Sauenni. Paræftor, þurh þet he wæs ðes kynges mæi of Engleland 7 þes eorles of Peitowe, þa geaf se eorl him þone abbotrice of Sancte Iohannis minstre of Angeli. Siððon þurh his micle wrences ða beiet he þone ærcebiscoprice of Besencun 7 hæfde hit þa on hande þre dagas; þa forlæs he þet mid rihte, forþi þet he hit hæfde æror beieten mid unrihte. Siððon þa beiet he þone

Superficially simple and repetitive, relying on the conjunctions *ond* and *oc*, this narrative proves on closer reading to be constructed with some subtlety ... If the diction is monotonous, so was Henry's pursuit of preferment: the recurrent *siððan* ... shows most apt use of *repetitio*.⁵⁶

The subtle variations of the phrase 'on hande' and the antithesis of 'rihte' and 'unrihte' unambiguously indicate Henry's acquisitiveness, and the indirect speeches given to him recreate through *polysyndeton* the arguments he uses to convince the king.⁵⁷ As a strategy this is hardly new; in fact it is a consistent feature of this chronicler's narrative style all across the Interpolations and the First Continuation. The use of parallel clauses, *polysyndeton* and repetition is strikingly similar to the narrative of the raid of Hereward on Peterborough (1070), which uses 'namen' repeatedly with 'ond' to convey the impression that a large amount of treasure was plundered by Hereward and his 'genge'.⁵⁸ On

biscoprice of Seintes, þet wæs fif mile fram his abbotrice, þet he hæfde fulneah seoueniht on hande; þenon brohte se abbot him of Clunni, swa swa he æror dide of Besencun. Pa bepohte he him þet gif he mihte ben rotfest on Engleland þet he mihte habben \e/al his wille.' (He was while in his clerical orders a bishop of Soissons; after that he became a monk in Cluny and afterwards a prior in the same monastery, and afterwards he became prior in Souvigny. Thereafter, because he was the kinsman of the king of England and the earl of Poitou, the earl then gave him the abbacy of Saint-Jean-d'Angély. After that through his great stratagems, he then obtained the archbishopric of Besançon, and held it in his hands for three days; then he lost it rightly, because he had before obtained it unjustly. After that he obtained the bishopric of Saintes, which was five miles from his abbey; he had that in hand almost seven nights; then the abbot of Cluny brought him from there, as he had done earlier from Besançon. Then it seemed to him that if he might be firmly rooted in England then he might be able to have all his will.). 'Sauenni' is here translated as 'Souvigny' rather than the more common 'Savigny' based on Cecily Clark, 'This Ecclesiastical Adventurer: Henry of Saint Jean d'Angély', *EHR* 84 (1969), 548–60, p. 556. Clark also notes that the chronicler of the First Continuation is reasonably accurate in his account, 'considering that it was based on hearsay of events stretching back over nearly forty years: the priorate at Souvigny is listed out of order, and the Besançon episode ... remains unconfirmed; otherwise the Chronicle's evidence agrees admirably with that of independent continental sources. This reliability concerning events far off in time as well as in place strengthens our trust in the chronicler's veracity about the contemporary ones of which his is the only record extant.'

⁵⁶ Clark, ed., *The Peterborough Chronicle*, p. lxxix.

⁵⁷ Henry's arguments accumulate within the brackets provided by the two verbs 'sæide' and 'iærnde'. '[B]esohte þa ðone kyng 7 sæide him þet he wæs eald man 7 forbroken man, 7 þet he ne mihte ðolen þa micelle unriht 7 þa micelle unsibbe ða wæron on here land, 7 iærnde þa purh him 7 purh ealle his freond namcuðlice þone abbotrice of Burhc' ([H]e then beseeched the king and said to him that he was an old man and a decrepit man and that he could not endure the great injustice and the great dissension that was in his land and entreated personally and through all his friends the abbacy of Burch by name).

⁵⁸ 'Hi namen þære twa gildene scrines 7 .ix. seolferne, 7 hi namen fifteen mycele roden, ge of golde ge of seolfre. Hi namen þære swa mycele gold 7 seolfre, 7 swa manega gersumas on sceat 7 on scrud 7 on bokes swa nan man ne mæi oðer tællen— sægdon þet hi hit dyden for ðes mynstres heoldscipe' (They took from there two golden shrines and nine [of] silver, and they seized fifteen great crosses, both of gold and silver. They took away from there so much gold and silver and so many treasures in garments and vestments and in books as no man may tell of any other [instance] – they said that they did it for

the other hand, the swift swarming movement of the raiders coming in to plunder the abbey is rendered through *asyndeton*,⁵⁹ much like the chronicler's description of the expulsion of Abbot Henry from the abbacy of Saint-Jean-d'Angély *s.a.*1131.

The coming of Abbot Henry to Peterborough marks a crisis for the abbey, for he is presented not as a protector but as a plunderer.⁶⁰ The striking metaphor of the drone taking the spoils accumulated by the bees is emphasised through alliteration and antithesis. Even the psalm sung on that particular day, 'Exurge Quare Obdormis, Domine?' seems to have a particular resonance with the abbey's condition.⁶¹ The predatory nature of the new abbot is further emphasised through the imagery of the Wild Hunt, also noted in *Hugh Candidus*.⁶² A parallel incident is noted by Orderic Vitalis as occurring in Normandy in 1091: a certain priest of English origin, Walchelm (Gualchelm), comes across the Wild Host, to which he applies the term 'familia Herlechini', represented as a troupe of damned souls from Hell. Though this description of the Wild Host has its sources and parallels in Germanic legend and folklore,⁶³ the event is narrated by the chronicler of the First Continuation as specific to Peterborough, and consequent upon the arrival of Abbot Henry.⁶⁴ The insistence upon the veracity of the event

[their] loyalty towards the minster). See Irvine, ed., *MS E*, p. 89. Also see Chapter 1, pp. 44–9.

⁵⁹ Ac hi na rohten na þing – geodon into þe mynstre; clumben upp to þe halge rode, namen þa þe kynehelm of ure Drih't'nes heafod eall of smeate golde, namen þa þet fotspure þe wæs undernæðen his fote, þet wæs eall of read golde; clumben upp to þe stepel, brohton dunc þet hæcce þe þær wæs behid, hit wæs eall of 'gold' 7 of seolfre' (But they did not reckon anything, went into the monastery, climbed up to the holy cross, then seized the royal crown from our Lord's head which was all of beaten gold; they then took the foot-rest that was underneath his foot, that was entirely of red gold; climbed up to the steeple, brought down the altar frontal that was concealed there, which was all of gold and silver).

⁶⁰ '7 þær he wunede eallriht swa drane doð onn hiue: eall þet þa beon dragen toward, swa fret þa drane 7 dragað fraward. Swa dide he: eall þet he mihte taken, wiðinnen 7 wiðuten, of læred 7 of læwed, swa he sende ouer sæ; 7 na god þær ne dide ne na god ðær ne læuede' (And there he dwelled just as drones do in a hive, all that the bees bring inside, that the drone devours and draws outward. So did he: all that he was able to take, within and without, from learned and lay, he sent over the sea; and neither did any good there nor left anything good therein).

⁶¹ 'Arise, why sleepest thou, O Lord?' (Psalm xliii, sung on the second Sunday before Lent). See Swanton, *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicles*, p. 258, n. 1.

⁶² Mellows, ed., *Hugh Candidus*, p. 101.

⁶³ As Kemp Malone notes, the origins of the word 'Harlequin', *Herlechin* in Orderic, seem to be English, see Kemp Malone, 'Herlekin and Herlewin', *Studies in Heroic Legend and in Current Speech*, ed. S. Einarsson and N. E. Eliason (Copenhagen, 1959), pp. 193–6, p. 196. The incident is noted in Chapter 17 of Book VIII of Orderic Vitalis, see Marjorie Chibnall, ed., *The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis*, 5 vols, OMT (Oxford, 1969–73), IV, pp. 240–5.

⁶⁴ 'þa son þæræfter þa sægon 7 herdon fela men feole huntas huntan: ða huntas wæron sarte 7 micele 7 ladlice, 7 here hundas ealle swarte 7 bradegede 7 ladlice, 7 hi ridone on swarte hors 7 on swarte bucces. Þis wæs segon on þe selue derfald in þa tune of Burch 7 on ealle þa wudes ða wæron fram þa selua tune to Stanforde, 7 þa muneces herdon ða

is further emphasised through the recurrence of verbs of sight and hearing, 'sægon' and 'herdon', and the mention of multiple witnesses. Unlike the priest Walchelm's solitary vision in Orderic's narrative, this vision is validated by the monks, visitors and '[s]oðfeste men'. The narrative ends with the chronicler unable to predict what the future might hold.⁶⁵

Abbot Henry goes back to his monastery (1128), persuading the king that he would relinquish his rights there, and the uncertainty of the abbey's situation finds expression through the chronicler's prayers, 'God ælmihtig haue his milce ofer þet wrecce stede!'.⁶⁶ The account of Abbot Henry's abbacy is placed alongside the chronicler's deepening critique of the wider ecclesiastical situation. In 1129 he notes the growing lack of ecclesiastical discipline: though the archdeacons and priests are ordered to relinquish their wives, 'ne forstod noht ealle þa bodlaces' (all the decrees stood to nothing). There seems to be a degree of irony when the chronicler refers to the ecclesiastical community as 'þet Cristendome hæfdon to begemen 7 to locen' (those who had to attend and look to Christendom), especially in the context of the 'swa mycel dwyld on Cristendom swa it næfre ær ne wæs' (such great heresy in Christendom as was never before), the choosing of the two popes in Rome. The vivid recreation of the expulsion of Abbot Henry from the abbacy of Saint-Jean-d'Angély in annal 1131 once again uses the standard narrative and literary techniques of this compiler.⁶⁷ The decisive action of the monks of Saint-Jean-d'Angély is

horn blawen þet hi blewen on nihtes. Soðfeste men heom kepten on nihtes; sæidon, þes þe heom þuhte, þet þær mihte wel ben abuton twenti oðer þritti hornblaweres. Þis wæs sægon 7 herd fram þet he þider com eall þet lentetid on an to Eastren' (and then soon after that many men saw and heard many hunters hunting: the hunters were black and large and repulsive, and their hounds were all black and wide-eyed and repulsive, and they rode on black horses and on black bucks/goats. This was seen in the same deer-park in the town of Burch and in all the woods which were from the same town to Stamford; and the monks heard the horn blowing that they blew during the nights. Truthful men who kept watch for them on nights said, as it seemed to them, that there could well be about twenty or thirty horn blowers. This was said and heard from those who came here all that Lenten-tide continuously till Easter).

⁶⁵ This seems more an expression of actual circumstances than a literary avowal of inadequacy. 'Þis was his ingang: of his utgang ne cunne we iett noht seggon' (This was his entrance: of his exit/its outcome we cannot say yet). Here 'his utgang' may be specific, referring to Abbot Henry, or a more general comment referring to the abbey.

⁶⁶ 'May Almighty God have compassion on that wretched place!'

⁶⁷ 'Des ilces geares for se abbot Heanri toforen Eastren fram Burch ofer sæ to Normandi 7 þær sprec mid þone kyng 7 sæide him þet se abbot of Clunni hefde him beboden þet he scolde cumen to him 7 betæcen him þone abbotrice of Angeli, 7 siðþen he wolde cumen ham be his læfe; 7 swa he ferde him to his agen mynstre 7 þær wunode eall to midsummerdæi. 7 ðes oðer dæies æfter Sancte Iohannis messedæi, cusen þa muneces abbot of himself and brohten him into cyrce mid processionem, sunge *Te Deum Laudamus*, ringden þa belle, setten him on þes abbots settle, diden him ealle hersumnesse swa swa hi scolden don here abbot. 7 se eorl 7 ealle þa heafedmenn 7 þa muneces of þa mynstre flemden se oðer abbot Heanri ut \of/ þa mynstre.' (In the same year the abbot Henry journeyed before Easter from Burch over the sea into Normandy, and there spoke with

conveyed through *asyndeton*, with the succession of verbs recreating the drama of the event and culminating in Henry's expulsion. This may be contrasted with the *polysyndeton* in the earlier part of the quoted narrative ('7 þær spreac ... 7 sæide him ... 7 betæcen'), always used to record Abbot Henry's persuasive convoluted arguments to the king. The chronicler also comments with some pleasure that for once, Abbot Henry's wiles were of no avail, and the metaphor used is striking in its reduction of the abbot.⁶⁸ The dramatic recreation of Abbot Henry's expulsion stems from a sense of difference, but, at the same time, indicates a possibility for Peterborough's future. Abbot Henry gains respite for the moment by promising to make Peterborough subservient to Cluny,⁶⁹ and the chronicler can only hope for better times:

Crist ræde for þa wrecce muneces of Burch 7 for þet wrecce \stede/ nu hem behofeð Cristes helpe 7 eall Cristenes folces.⁷⁰

The narrative of the Interpolations created an ideal image of the abbey, a monastic community with a rich Anglo-Saxon past, enriched through royal patronage, and resilient in the face of change, depredation and conflict. Therefore, for this chronicler at least, the danger of Peterborough losing its very identity by being absorbed into the Cluniac circle was very real. His growing disenchantment with ecclesiastical policy

the king and said to him that the abbot of Cluny had commanded him that he should come to him [i.e. the king] and give up to him the abbacy of Angély, and by his leave after that, he would come home; and so he journeyed to his own monastery and stayed there right till Midsummer Day. And the next day after St John's Mass day, the monks chose an abbot from themselves and brought him into the church with processions, sang *Te Deum Laudamus*, rang the bell, set him on the abbot's chair and did him all the obedience that they do to their abbot. And the earl and all the leaders and the monks of the minster expelled the other abbot Henry from that minster).

⁶⁸ 'Her him truce ealle his mycele cræftes; nu him behofed þet he crape in his mycele codde in ælc hyrne, gif þær wære hure an unwreste wrenc þet he mihte get beswicen anes Crist 7 eall Cristene folc.' (Here all his great tricks deceived him, now it suited him that he [should] creep into his great bag [of deceptions] in every corner, if there was at least one untrustworthy stratagem so that he might yet once more deceive Christ and all Christian people.) While the Peterborough chronicler has never had a high opinion of the abbot, the use of the verb *crape* drastically reduces his stature and has an almost visual impact.

⁶⁹ 'Þa ne cuþe he him na betre bote bute behet hem 7 aðes swor on halidom þet gif he moste Engleland secen þet he scolde begotten hem ðone mynstre of Burch, swa þet he scolde setten þær prior of Clunni 7 circweard 7 hordere 7 reilþein, 7 ealle þa ðing þa wæron wiðinne mynstre 7 wiðuten, eall he scolde hem betæcen.' (Then he knew no better remedy for himself except to promise them, and swore oaths on holy things that if he could reach England, he would acquire for them the monastery of Burch, so that he could set there a prior of Cluny, and also a warden and a treasurer and a wardrobe keeper, and everything that was within and without the monastery he would deliver to them.)

⁷⁰ 'May Christ take counsel for the wretched monks of Burch and for that wretched place, now Christ's help and that of all Christian people is needful for them.'

and his awareness of change and deterioration reaches its culmination in this annal. The account of Abbot Henry is couched within a narrative of natural disaster, fire and the decimation of livestock, the two sections of the annal being paralleled by the use of ‘*Des ilces geares*’.⁷¹ The reduction to nothingness is emphasised through the emphatic use of negatives and repetition,⁷² followed by a prayer for remedy, thus exactly paralleling the structure of the following narrative (i.e. Abbot Henry’s expulsion). As in the use of the disaster *topoi* in the Interpolations, the structural correspondence between the two sections of the annal enforces contextual affinity between natural disasters and Peterborough’s condition under the rule of Abbot Henry. This is the last entry of the First Continuation. The narrative of Peterborough’s glorious past reinforces the chronicler’s implied hope that Peterborough would be able to take charge of its own destiny like the monks of Saint-Jean-d’Angély. Yet, as it stands, the contemporary reality portrayed in the First Continuation only serves as a poignant contrast to the ideal vision of the past in the Interpolations.

Abbot Henry’s ultimate departure from Peterborough is noted in 1132, as part of the Second Continuation written twenty years later. It is indeed a mystery as to why the departure of Abbot Henry from Peterborough was not noted with the same jubilation as his expulsion from Saint-Jean-d’Angély. Given this chronicler’s involvement with his narrative, it is possible that the incident may have been omitted from the narrative of the First Continuation because the author or chronicler had been incapacitated by death or disease. And it is striking indeed that not only did it take the abbey substantial time to nominate a suitable replacement, but that the text also remained the responsibility of one person rather than a passing succession of scribes.

The Second Continuation: annals 1132–1154

While the Interpolations and the First Continuation demonstrate structural and stylistic parallels, the Second Continuation stands apart, both with respect to the time of its construction and its scribal

⁷¹ This phrase is characteristic of the annal tradition; for its implementation as a mode of intensification, see the discussion of annal 1116, Chapter 1, p. 53.

⁷² ‘*Des ilces geares wæs swa micel o\ r\ fcwalm swa hit næfre ær ne wæs on manne gemynd ofer eall Engleland – þet wæs on næt 7 on swin – swa þet on þa tun þa wæs tenn ploges oðer twelfe gangende, ne belæf þær noht an, 7 se man þa heafde twa hundred oðþe ðre hundred swin, ne beleaf him noht an’* (In the same year there was such a cattle-plague over all England as it never was before within human memory – that was amongst cattle and amongst swine – so that the village where ten ploughs or twelve were working, not a single one remained, and the man who had two hundred or three hundred swine, not a single one remained to him).

practice. Though dealing with events from 1132 to 1154, it was written in a single block around 1154/55, possibly during the reign of Henry II (whose accession is noted), with a new scribe and a new compiler taking over after a period of about twenty years.

The Second Continuation is of great importance for linguistic scholarship, and may be seen as a textual witness to the change from Old English to Middle English.⁷³ From a historical point of view, it provides a near-contemporary narrative of the 'horrors' of the Anarchy in 1137.⁷⁴ Barring that, it has been summarily dismissed as having hardly any virtues whatsoever. Clark considers that 'the entries from 1138 on fall below the literary level of the earlier ones: the imperfect grasp of the material evident throughout the entry for 1140 seems accompanied by a loss of stylistic skill ... by contrast with the highly wrought account of the Anarchy the plainer prose of the entries for 1138, 1140, and 1154 seems at first sight almost to suggest different authorship'.⁷⁵

Clark's comments are not entirely unjustified. The annalistic framework seems inadequate for this Peterborough narrative, and the prevalent impression is that the events are written according to topic rather than according to chronology, 'with social and ecclesiastical matters gathered under 1137 and military and political ones under 1140'.⁷⁶ This may have been due to the retrospective nature of this phase of the Peterborough text as, twenty years after the First Continuation, it may certainly have been easier to organise events by subject (involving narrative cause and effect), rather than according to chronology. Nevertheless, despite its presumed narrative faults, the very existence of this phase of the Peterborough text is significant. Theoretically, the E text could have ended with the First Continuation; if the narrative had seemed somewhat incomplete regarding the progress of Abbot Henry, it would have been a simple matter

⁷³ Clark analyses the language on pp. xxxvii–lxxiv in her edition of *The Peterborough Chronicle*; also see the extensive consideration of the language of the First and Second Continuations in Irvine, ed., *MS E*, pp. ciii–clxvi.

⁷⁴ The death of Henry I in 1135 led to the forced accession of his nephew Stephen of Blois, even though Henry had named his daughter Matilda as heir, after the loss of his only legitimate son, William, in the disaster of the White Ship in 1120. Stephen took over as king by acquiring control over the royal treasury; he was helped by his brother Bishop Henry. This led to a period when allegiances see-sawed between Stephen and Matilda; this period of instability and political chaos has been termed as the 'Anarchy'. Detailed contemporary accounts are found in K. R. Potter, ed., *Gesta Stephani*, OMT (Oxford, 1976) and E. King and K. R. Potter, eds, *William of Malmesbury, Historia Novella*, OMT (Oxford, 1998). There are a number of studies of the Anarchy, considering especially whether it was quite so anarchic as has been popularly thought; see, for example, E. King, ed., *The Anarchy of King Stephen's Reign* (Oxford, 1994). The classic and extremely readable account remains that by R. H. C. Davis, *King Stephen 1135–1154* (London, 1967).

⁷⁵ Clark, ed., *The Peterborough Chronicle*, p. lxxxvi.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. xxv–xxvi.

to insert his expulsion later.⁷⁷ This is indeed noted as part of the Second Continuation *s.a.* 1132, though, by then, the issue had lost the immediacy that it had had for the previous chronicler and is not dwelt upon in much detail.

The section of the manuscript containing the Second Continuation is written as a single unit, indicating copying after this entire section had been compiled. The scribal hand writing it has been considered identical to that which makes corrections in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 134 (Berengaudus). This hand, Bishop notes, is also identical to the hand which writes the twelfth-century portion (folios 6–71) of the *Liber Niger*, Peterborough's earliest cartulary,⁷⁸ the resemblance being particularly clear in the Old English portions of the cartulary.⁷⁹ The writing of this portion is more 'compressed' than the earlier portion (received annals and First Continuation),⁸⁰ and it is possible that the later scribe is imitating the former.⁸¹ The manuscript evidence corroborates, at the very outset, two of the recurrent themes in this analysis of the *Peterborough Chronicle*. One is the involvement with other texts being produced at Peterborough around the same time (the scribal link with the construction of the *Liber Niger* in this case). The other is an attempt to maintain the appearance of textual continuity with the earlier part of the text, indicated here by the overall similarity between the writing of the second scribe and that of his predecessor.⁸² Further, as the subsequent analysis will demonstrate, the narrative of the Second Continuation (like that of the Interpolations and the First Continuation) is informed by a conscious ideological focus and a continuing interest in Peterborough.

⁷⁷ As perhaps in the case of the D text, which shows a continuing interest in Scottish affairs. The last entry in D for 1079 seems to be incomplete, after which the next entry is added almost twenty years later. The entry for 1130 is miswritten 1080, and records the rebellion of Angus, earl of Moray, see Introduction, pp. 13–14.

⁷⁸ Bishop, 'Notes', p. 440. Also see Irvine, ed., *MS E*, p. xiii.

⁷⁹ Whitelock, *Peterborough Chronicle*, p. 14.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 17. Ker, *Catalogue*, p. 426 notes it as written in a 'more compressed and later type of script'.

⁸¹ As described by Humfrey Wanley in G. Hickes, *Linguarum vett. septentrionalium thesaurus grammatico-criticus et archæologicus*, 2 vols (Oxford, 1705), II, and also noted in Whitelock, *Peterborough Chronicle*, p. 17. Irvine, ed., *MS E*, pp. xviii–xxiii notes the characteristics of both scribal hands. Wanley's conclusion may have been based on some palaeographical features shared by both scribes noted in detail by Irvine: for example, the 'f' with a long descender; the use of a 'k' with a closed bow in the latter part of the First Continuation and consistently in the Second; the 2-shaped 'r' which follows 'o' sometimes in the First and always in the Second Continuation; the dotted and straight limbed 'y', and the use of the *e-caudata* for 'æ'.

⁸² Chapter 3, pp. 105–10 considers in greater detail the implications of the scribal links between the Peterborough manuscripts, and what it means for historiography at Peterborough.

Peterborough and the Anarchy

The account of the Anarchy in annal 1137 has always been regarded as a focal point of this phase of the E text. However, far from being an eyewitness account, it is written in retrospect 'nineteen winters' later. This chronicler begins his account with a conventional statement of literary inadequacy:

I ne can ne I ne mai tellen alle þe wunder ne alle þe pines ðat hi diden
wrece men on þis land; 7 ðat lastede þa xix winter wile Stephne was
king, 7 æure it was uerse 7 uerse.⁸³

He then launches into a narrative of worsening times before concluding again, 'Suilc, 7 mare þanne we cunnen sæin, we þolenden .xix. wintre for ure sinnes'.⁸⁴ A double reference to the time span, 'nineteen winters', should alert us to the fact that by the time the narrative was written conditions were not so chaotic, and had perhaps taken a turn for the better – towards the political security promised by the reign of Henry II.

If so, what was the necessity of chronicling the 'horrors' that were now part of the past? Writing contemporary or near-contemporary history was fraught with dangers as well as responsibility, as William of Malmesbury was well aware when he wrote his version of events. 'I am undertaking to unravel the trackless maze of events and occurrences that befell in England', he wrote in the Prologue to the third book of the *Historia Novella*,

with the aim that posterity should not be ignorant of these matters through our lack of care, it being worthwhile to learn the changefulness of fortune and the mutability of human lot, by God's permission or bidding. Therefore, as we men of the present day severely and rightly blame our predecessors, who since Bede have left no record of themselves and their doings, I, who have set myself to remove this disgrace from us, may fairly claim the kindly favour of my readers if they judge aright.⁸⁵

The chronicler of the Second Continuation never makes such a clearly defined statement of authorial intent. Therefore, we need to factor

⁸³ 'I neither know nor may tell of all the horrors or all the tortures that they subjected wretched men to in this land; and that lasted the nineteen winters while Stephen was king, and always it was worse and worse.'

⁸⁴ 'Such, and more than we can say, we suffered nineteen winters for our sins.'

⁸⁵ '... inextricabem laberinthum rerum et negotiorum quae acciderunt in Anglia aggredior eulore; ea causa, ne per nostram incuriam lateat posteros, cum sit opere pretium cognoscere uolubilitatem fortunae statuesque humani mutabilitatem, Deo mediocriter et merito reprehendunt predecessores nostros, qui nec sui nec suorum post Bedam ullam reliquerunt memoriam, ego, qui a nobis hanc proposui summouere infamiam, debeo apud lectores bonam, si recte iudicabunt, pacisci gratiam'. King and Potter, eds, *William of Malmesbury, Historia Novella*, pp. 80–1.

in two linked aspects of his narrative in order to discern if it was motivated by a similar desire to narrate events for posterity: its status as a narrative of historical 'facts' (a minefield in medieval historiography) and its overall impression.

There is no reason to believe that the account in the E text is false in any way. Atrocities were indeed committed by the 'rice men' who lorded over the castles which become synonymous with oppression in post-Conquest narrative, and the political imbalance was bound to affect economic stability. However, what is striking is the chronicler's preoccupation with the nitty-gritty of torture methods, a focus on their corporeal aspect which sometimes seems to border on vulgar curiosity.⁸⁶ The repetition of verbs of violence ('pined' or 'hanged'), and the accumulative effect of the parallel clauses, 'Me hanged ... Me hanged ... Me dide', 'aptly represents the relentlessness of the oppressors',⁸⁷ but once again, the narrative style is similar to the strategies used in the Interpolations and the First Continuation. However, this Peterborough chronicler is not alone in his narrative of 'horrors'. The First Continuation of Simeon's history of the church of Durham, for example, contains an account which parallels the extract quoted above. It records an attack on the monastery by William Cumin, who was opposed to the election of William of Sainte-Barbe as bishop. This part of Simeon's text seems to have been written 'probably not long after the restoration of peace and order which followed the installa-

⁸⁶ 'Þa namen hi þa men þe hi wenden ðat ani god hefde \n/, bathe be nihtes 7 be dæies, carlmen 7 wimmen, 7 diden heom \in prisun/ 7 pined heom efter gold 7 syluer untellendlice pining, for ne uuaeren næure nan martyrs swa pined alse hi wæron. Me hanged up bi the fet 7 smoked heom mid ful smoke. Me hanged bi the þumbes oðer bi the hefed 7 hengen bryniges on \her/ fet. Me dide cnotted strenges abuton here hæued 7 uurythen it ðat it gaede to þe \h/ærnes. Hi diden heom in quarterne þar nadres 7 snakes 7 pades wæron inne, 7 drapen heom swa. Sume hi diden in crucethus, ðat is in an ceste þat was scort 7 nareu 7 undep, 7 dide scærpe stanes þerinne 7 þrengde þe man þerinne ðat him bræcon alle þe limes. In mani of þe castles wæron lof 7 grin, ðat wæron rachenteges þat twa oþer thre men hadden onoh to bæron onne; þat was sua maked: ðat is faestned to an beom, 7 diden an scærp iren abuton þa mannes throte 7 his hals ðat he \ne/ myhte nowiderwardes, ne sitten ne lien ne slepen, oc bæron al ðat iren. Mani þusen hi drapen mid hungær.' (Then they seized those men who they thought had any property, both by night and by day, both men and women, and put them in prison, and tortured them for gold and silver with unspeakable tortures, for never were any martyrs tortured as they were. Many were hung up by the feet, and they smoked them with foul smoke. Many were hung by the thumbs or by the head, and they hung mail-coats on their feet. Many had knotted strings put around their heads and twisted till it went to the brains. They put them in prisons/dungeons where there were adders and snakes and toads, and destroyed them thus. Some they put in a 'crucethus', that is into a chest that was short and narrow and shallow, and put sharp stones therein and put pressure/ crushed the man in there so that his limbs were all broken. In many of the castles there was a 'lof and grin', those were chains that two or three men had enough to do to carry one. Those were thus made: that is fastened to a beam, and a sharp iron put around the man's throat and his neck, so that he could not either sit nor lie nor sleep in any direction, but bear all that iron. Many thousands they destroyed with hunger).

⁸⁷ Clark, ed., *The Peterborough Chronicle*, p. lxxxiv.

tion of William of St Barbara (1144).⁸⁸ While both narratives bear remarkable similarities in the vividness of their description, there are also differences in narrative tone. The Peterborough chronicler shows a distinct tendency to explain the terms that he uses, for example, a 'crucethus' or a 'lof 7 grin'. The Durham narrative, though describing some tortures as novelties ('the new cruelty transformed an ancient form of torture'), gives no nomenclature like that of the Peterborough chronicler.⁸⁹ The Peterborough chronicler may have felt the need to explain such intricacies of torture, perhaps for dramatic effect, or because he thought that his audience needed more explanation. However, given that these terms or corresponding descriptions never exactly match other contemporary accounts, it is also possible that the Second Continuator derived his information from oral accounts.

Clark has also pointed out further parallels to the narrative in the E text, with the *Historia Novella*, the *Gesta Stephani* and the *Liber Eliensis*

⁸⁸ T. Arnold, ed., *Symeon of Durham: Historical Works*, RS 75, 2 vols (London, 1882–85), I, p. xxiv. Rollason, the most recent editor of the text, notes that the date of composition of the continuation is uncertain; however, the earliest manuscript of Symeon's history was copied in two stages 'in the second half of the twelfth century'. He concurs with Arnold in stating that 'as a whole, the continuation must of course have been written after 1144, the date of Sainte-Barbe's installation described in it, and the date of the hand concerned, that is, some time in the second half of the twelfth century, perhaps the 1160s'. See David Rollason, ed., *Symeon of Durham: Tract on the Origins and Progress of this the Church of Durham*, OMT (Oxford, 2000), p. lxvii and pp. 298–301. See also Arnold, ed., *Symeon of Durham*, I, pp. 152–4.

⁸⁹ 'Quem insequentes qui cum Willelmo erant, extremos agminis quos capere poterant misere trucidabant; alios truncates membris laniabant, quosdam multatos incarcerabant; paucos, quos gladiis suis indignos credebant, per pecunia redemptionem dimittebant ... Plurimus autem erat ac uarius tormentum modus; et quam dictu difficile, tam etiam auditu incredibile. Suspendebantur per domos in parietibus homines, in transuersum medii corporis funibus coartatis, et collo atque pedibus immensis loricarum sive saxorum ponderibus alligatis; pars utraque corporis terrae comprimebatur, nec tamen terram pressa tangebatur ... Ad hæc accedebat genus illud supplicii exquisitum, quo simul compressa in arctissimi loculi spatio membra collidebant; ubi supplicii antiquum genus nova transmutabat crudelitas. Quomodo enim distensa per eculeum crescebat olim membra ad supplicium, sic modo e contra in se coartata minorabantur, et aliquando confracta interius rumpebantur. Super hoc autem uinculorum immanitatem, carceris feditatem, famis enormitatem quis explicare sufficiat?' (The men who were with William Cumin followed him, and those at the end of the bishop's column whom they were able to capture they mercilessly slaughtered. Others they mutilated by cutting off their limbs; others they stripped of their possessions and flung into prison. A few, whom they thought unworthy of their swords, they ransomed ... The kinds of torments they inflicted were various and many, and as difficult to explain as they were incredible to hear about. They hung men from the walls of the houses with ropes tied tightly around the middle of their bodies, and great weights of mail or stones attached to their neck or feet, so that both parts of the body were dragged down towards the ground without actually touching it ... To this was added that exquisite form of torture in which all the members of the body were crushed and ground together in the very narrow space of a box, so that the new cruelty transformed an ancient form of torture. In a similar way limbs used to be stretched out in the torture of a rack, and then compressed and crushed together, so that they were often broken internally. Who is equal to describing the inhumanity of the shackles, the filth of the prison, the enormity of the starvation?). See Rollason, ed., *Symeon of Durham*, pp. 298–301, for the full episode.

also describing this time of political imbalance and oppression, though in far less lurid terms than either the E text or the Durham narrative. However, it is not the aim of this study to refer to all narratives parallel to 1137 E.⁹⁰ The detailed contemporary descriptions of horrors are remarkably similar in their contents, and have been termed a 'typology of torture' by Rigg.⁹¹ In fact, the E text seems to share one thing or other with almost every contemporary narrative, without being identical to any one text. This resemblance to many 'independent records from widely-scattered areas' is proof to Clark of 'how far such sufferings were from being merely local or personal'.⁹² It is possible that the chronicler of the Second Continuation had access to other texts which influenced his narrative; King, for example, notes that the ideas in the account of the Anarchy in William of Malmesbury, 'were developed, in the same order, in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, strongly suggesting that this text from Malmesbury was available at Peterborough in King Stephen's lifetime'.⁹³ King even suggests a possible link between the two texts, linking a member of the de Waterville family (one of whom later became abbot of Peterborough) with Robert, earl of Gloucester (to whom William of Malmesbury's *Historia Novella* is dedicated).⁹⁴ The truth of this assertion is difficult to prove, but the possibility of multiple sources of information, or even a convention of narration, problematises the commonly held idea that the narrative of the Second Continuation conveys a deeply personal impression of the Anarchy. I would like to suggest here that this impression of a subjective narrative, while undoubtedly based on real events and experiences, is also a rhetorical device, and one that has already been used to great effect in earlier portions of the text. In a narrative written largely in retrospect, and with no evidence of any palpable wrong done to Peterborough abbey in particular, it functions in a manner similar to the use of exclamatory statements in the Interpolations, where the narrative style implies an authorial involvement with events, which is actually superficial and rhetorical.

⁹⁰ A full and comprehensive list may be found in the notes to annals 1131–1154, see Clark, ed., *The Peterborough Chronicle*, pp. 106–9.

⁹¹ A. G. Rigg, *A History of Anglo-Latin Literature 1066–1422* (Cambridge, 1992), p. 32.

⁹² Clark, ed., *The Peterborough Chronicle*, pp. xxxvi–xxxvii. Yet, paradoxically, with the same breath she notes the personal nature of the events communicated: 'At all events, what cannot be questioned is the truth of this passage to the writer's own experience; it most eloquently expresses a contemporary civilian's feelings when faced with the brutality of robber barons.'

⁹³ See p. 2 of the Introduction in King, ed., *The Anarchy of King Stephen's Reign*.

⁹⁴ 'The ASC concludes with the election of William de Waterville as abbot of Peterborough ... The Waterville family were hereditary stewards of the abbey of Peterborough; a younger brother of the contemporary tenant of the abbey fee was Geoffrey de Waterville; and Geoffrey de Waterville was the steward of Robert earl of Gloucester'. See the Introduction to King and Potter, eds, *William of Malmesbury, Historia Novella*, pp. xcv–xcvi.

This implies the compiler's awareness of the narrative strategies used in the preceding parts of the text, and can best be explained by looking at this entry in some detail.

The account of the 'horrors' of the Anarchy is split into two parts in the annal. The first part describes the tortures, and ends with the chronicler's statement that he is unable to narrate all the horrors in their entirety.⁹⁵ However, the narrative does not end here. The chronicler is, in fact, able to narrate a substantial portion of further 'wunder[s]', the taxes ('tenserie') laid on the land, the rising prices of essential goods, and the wretched condition of the common people.

[S]ume ieden on ælmes þe waren sum wile rice men, sume flugen ut of lande. Wes næure gæt mare wre\c/cehed on land ne næure hethen men werse ne diden þan hi diden, for ouer sithon ne forbaren \hi/nouther circe ne cyrcæird, oc namen al þe god ðat þarinne was 7 brenden sythen þe cyrce 7 al tegædere. Ne hi ne forbaren biscopes land ne abbots ne preostes, ac ræueden munekes 7 clerekes, 7 æuric man other þe ouermyhte. Gif twa men oþer .iii. coman ridend to an tun, al þe tunscepe flugæn for heom, wenden ðat hi wæron ræueres. Þe biscopes 7 lered men heom cursede æure, oc was heom naht þarof, for hi uueron al forcursæd 7 forsuoren 7 forloren. War sæ me tilede, þe erthe ne bar nan corn, for þe land was al fordon mid suilce dædes. 7 hi sæden openlice ðat Crist slep 7 his halechen.⁹⁶

As in the narrative of the Interpolations and the First Continuation, there is the use of parallel clauses ('Sume ieden ... Sume flugen') and repetition for emphasis ('nouther circe ne cyrcæird', or 'for hi uueron al forcursæd 7 forsuoren 7 forloren'). The narrative contains one of the most evocative (and one of the most quoted) statements regarding the wretched state of the land and its people ('Wherever men tilled, the earth bore no corn, because the land was all ruined with such deeds. And they said openly that Christ and his saints slept').⁹⁷ There seems

⁹⁵ An avowal of literary inadequacy is a particularly common *topos* in literature, see for example the similar statement made by the Durham chronicler in the extract quoted in note 89 above, 'Who is equal to describing the inhumanity of the shackles, the filth of the prison, the enormity of the starvation?.'

⁹⁶ 'Some subsisted on alms, who were once powerful men. Some fled out of this land. There was never more wretched [people] on this land, nor ever had the heathen men done worse than they did; for often they spared neither church nor churchyard, but took away all the goods that were in there, and after that, burnt the church and all with it. Nor did they spare the bishops' land nor abbots' nor priests', but plundered monks and clerks, and every man who was stronger [robbed] the other. If two men or three came riding into a village, all the villagers fled because of them, thinking that they were plunderers. The bishops and the clergy always excommunicated them, but it was nothing to them, for they were all accursed and forsworn and lost. Wherever men tilled, the earth bore no corn, because the land was all ruined with such deeds. And they said openly that Christ and his saints slept.'

⁹⁷ C. W. Hollister, 'The Aristocracy', in *The Anarchy of King Stephen's Reign*, ed. E. King (Oxford, 1994), pp. 37–66, notes on p. 51 that the 'anarchic conditions of Stephen's

to be an imaginative association where the sins of the ravagers find an external equivalent in the barrenness of the land; and the comparison with the raids of the 'hethen men' suggests that the inhabitants of the land had turned plunderers and 'ræueres', committing deeds against the very fabric of social existence. It is unclear here whether the plundering by the 'hethen men' refers to the Danish invasions during King Alfred's time, or the later invasion of Swein and Cnut, and the very lack of specificity by this chronicler evokes a body of past narrative and past sorrows, all part of the proto-E *Chronicle* which formed the base text of the Peterborough version. At the very heart of the dramatic narrative lies an oblique act of internal cross-referencing, drawing on the very tradition of historiography represented by the E text.

When King quotes part of the above extract in his Introduction to *The Anarchy of King Stephen's Reign*, he comments that the 'conclusion' was 'fatalistic'.⁹⁸ But the annal does not conclude at this point, and, in focussing on the narrative of the Anarchy, critics seem to have ignored the importance of the narrative that follows. The subsequent narrative is in fact very different from what precedes it, and the chronicler focuses now specifically on Peterborough:

On al þis yuele time heold Martin abbot his abbotrice .xx. winter 7 half gær 7 .viii. dæis mid micel suinc, 7 fand þe muneces 7 te gestes al þat heom behoued 7 heold mycel carited in the hus 7 þoþwethere wrohte on þe circe 7 sette þarto landes 7 rentes 7 goded it suythe 7 læt it refen 7 brohte heom into þe neuuæ mynstre on Sancte Petres mæssedæi mid micel wurtscipe; ðat was anno ab Incarnatione Domini Millessimo .cxl. a combustionē loci .xxiii. 7 he for \to/ Rome 7 þær wæs wæl underfangen fram þe Pape Eugenie 7 begæt thare priuileges: an of alle þe landes of þabbotrice 7 an oþer of þe landes þe lien to þe circewican; 7 gif he leng moste liuen, alse he mint to don of þe horderwycan. 7 he begæt in landes þat rice men hefden mid strengthe: of Willelm Malduit, þe heold Rogingham þæ castel, he wan Cotingham 7 Estun, 7 of Hugo of Walteruile he uuan Hyrtlingbyri 7 Stanewig 7 .lx. solidos of Aldewingle \ælc gær/. 7 he makede manie muneces 7 plantede winiærd 7 makede mani weorkes 7 wende þe tun betere þan it ær wæs 7 wæs god munec 7 god man, 7 forþi him luueden God 7 gode men.⁹⁹

England resulted not only from battles, of which there were a few, and castle sieges, of which there were many, but also from the far more destructive tactics of devastating the lands and villages around an enemy castle in order to deprive the enemy of sustenance, or conversely, sallying forth from a castle to loot and destroy defenceless farms and manors in order to re-supply the garrison and starve its besiegers. The devastation of productive lands was, indeed, the most characteristic feature of medieval warfare, and it was rampant in Stephen's England.'

⁹⁸ King, ed., *Anarchy of King Stephen's Reign*, p. 1.

⁹⁹ 'In all this evil time Abbot Martin held his abbacy for twenty and a half years and eight days with great effort, and provided the monks and the guests with all that was necessary for them and held great ceremonial almsgivings and commemoration feasts in the house and nevertheless worked on the church and established lands and

Abbot Martin's consolidation of the abbey's resources is conveyed through the remarkable use of the connective, a stylistic strategy that may be compared to the narration of Abbot Henry's ruthless accumulation of preferment and position.¹⁰⁰ Markedly different in tone from the preceding narrative of the Anarchy, and Abbot Henry's grasping pursuit of power narrated in the First Continuation, this part of the annal emphasises the security that the abbot provides in the chaotic landscape. This impression is conveyed by the proliferation of verbs of construction ('fand þe muneces ... wrohte on þe circe ... begæð thare priuileges ... makede manie munekes 7 plantede winiærd 7 makede mani weorkes'), as opposed to the words of destruction in the earlier section. The imagery of planting serves as an effective contrast to the barrenness of the land ('þe erthe ne bar nan corn'), and the constructive effort that Abbot Martin put into the maintenance of the abbey ('micel suinc') is in opposition to the oppression of the wretched men ('Hi suencten suyðe uurecce men of þe land mid castelweorces'). While the country submitted to the lords of the castles who consolidated their land and power at the cost of the common weal, Abbot Martin created a *locus amoenus*, a haven of safety and security, and managed, even in these turbulent times, to obtain land for the abbey: Cottingham, Easton, Irthlingborough, Stanwick, and an annual income of sixty shillings from Aldwinkle, sufficient to get him the epithet of a 'god munec 7 god man'. The abbot also journeyed to Rome to obtain papal privileges from Pope Eugenius; the documents referred to in passing in E are given in full in *Hugh Candidus*.¹⁰¹ And, amidst the constructive functions of the abbot, a reference is made to another Peterborough disaster of great magnitude, the burning of the abbey in 1116, noted earlier in the text by the predecessor of this Peterborough chronicler. Twenty-three years after the burning of the abbey, Abbot Martin inaugurates the new building: this becomes a vindication of Peterborough abbey's ability to triumph over the ravages of time.¹⁰²

revenues for it, and greatly enriched it, and had it roofed and brought them into the new minster on Saint Peter's mass day with great honour/ceremony; that was the year 1140 from the Lord's Incarnation, and twenty-three years from the burning of the place. And he journeyed to Rome, and was there well received by the Pope Eugenius and got privileges from there: one for all the lands of the abbacy, and another for the lands that belong to the sacrist; and if he were able to live longer, he meant to do the same for the treasurer. And he got back lands that powerful men held by force: from William Maudit, who held the castle of Rockingham, he won Cottingham and Easton, and from Hugo of Waterville he won Irthlingborough and Stanwick and sixty shillings from Aldwinkle each year. And he made many monks and planted a vineyard and made many buildings and changed the town to better than it was before and he was a good monk and a good man, and therefore God and good men loved him.'

¹⁰⁰ For Abbot Henry, see above, pp. 76–81.

¹⁰¹ See Mellows, ed., *Hugh Candidus*, pp. 108–19.

¹⁰² The importance of such security within the monastic community is also made apparent

Echoes, parallels and differences

I have suggested that the real focus of annal 1137 is not the narrative of disaster, but a narrative of acquisition and vindication. These two aspects are clearly marked out – each aspect of the narrative of ‘horrors’ is contrasted with, and opposed to, the constructive efforts of the abbot. This conscious parallelism between sections of the same annal is also a feature of other annals of the Second Continuation, most notably annal 1154, where the narrative first notes the consecration of Henry II in London,¹⁰³ and then the consecration of William of Waterville at Lincoln after the death of Abbot Martin.¹⁰⁴ The identical language (‘underfangen mid micel wurtscipe 7 to king bletcæd in Lundene’, in the case of the king’s coronation, and ‘bletcæd [to abbot] ær he ham come 7 [sithen] was underfangen [mid mic]el [wurtscipe] at Burch’ in the case of the abbot) draws attention to the parallel between the two ceremonies. Just as the breakdown of royal power under King Stephen was contrasted with the order imposed by Abbot Martin, the hopes and aspirations associated with the consecration of Henry II as king are now transferred to the election of William of Waterville. This structural parallel in the narrative of the Second Continuation draws attention to the strong and conscious ideological purpose behind its compilation, where the principal intention of the narrative is to show the abbey and its abbots in a positive light.

A phrase in this narrative stands out, particularly given its echoes in the preceding phase of the Peterborough text. Both king and abbot are ‘underfangen mid micel wurtscipe’, and it is a phrase also used

by the Battle Abbey chronicler, who praises similar qualities in Abbot Walter, brother of Richard de Luci (Searle, ed., *Battle Abbey*, pp. 142–3): ‘Prelationis ergo consecutus apicem, cepit prudenter ecclesie profectibus intus et extra inuigilare. Et quamvis tunc temporis dissidentibus inter se proceribus regni, tota undique patrie libertas et opulentia, conturbantibus ac distrahentibus maliuolis, quia regia abutebantur simplici mansuetudine, sceuo exemplo pro libitu cederet; ipse tamen et ecclesie thesaurus / terrasque ac libertates regalesque consuetudines eidem delegates, inter tantos turbinum fluctus inuiolabiles seruari uiriliter insistebat.’ (Having become abbot, he began to watch prudently over the interior and exterior progress of the church. At that time the magnates of the realm were in discord amongst themselves and everywhere the whole liberty and prosperity of the country was thrown into confusion by the malevolent, who abused the ingenuous and gentle king, and whoever liked might follow the evil precedent. Yet the abbot stood manfully firm in the midst of such a storm, to preserve unharmed the treasures of the church, its lands, liberties and royal customs).

¹⁰³ ‘Þa he to Engleland com, þa was he underfangen mid micel wurtscipe 7 to king bletcæd in Lundene on þe Sunnendæi beforen midwintre dæi, 7 held þære micel curt.’ (When he came to England, then he was received with great honour and consecrated as king in London on the Sunday before midwinter day and there held a great court).

¹⁰⁴ ‘7 He ferde him sonþe to Lincoln, 7 wæs þ[ær] bletcæd to abbot] ær he ham come 7 [sithen] was underfangen [mid mic]el [wurtscipe] at Burch mid [mice]ll processiu, ... 7 [nu is] abbot 7 fa[ir] haued begunnon. Crist him un[ne þus enden]!’ (And he journeyed immediately to Lincoln and was there consecrated as abbot before he came home, and was afterwards received with great honour at Burch with a great procession ... and is now abbot and has made a fair beginning. Christ grant that he end thus!)

s.a.1132 (when Abbot Martin came to the monastery 'mid micel wurscipe'), and s.a. 1140, when Henry II (then earl of Anjou) comes to England.¹⁰⁵ In the narrative of the First Continuation, the recurrent use of this phrase imbued it with negative connotations, and was almost invariably associated with failure and treachery. The same phrase seems here to have become part of the praise vocabulary for Henry II and Peterborough abbots. Though the phrase itself recalls the language of the First Continuator, the context is very different. The honour done to both king and bishop not only links up the hopes and aspirations of a new era, but also hearkens back to the ideal past as articulated through the Interpolations, a time when royalty and the community at Peterborough worked together in harmony. Given the chronicler's sustained focus on the fortunes of Peterborough abbey, and particularly its ability to weather all storms, it is not surprising that this vocabulary of praise serves as a counterpoint to the uncertain times narrated in the First Continuation. The similarity in language seems to imply that the chronicler of the Second Continuation was well aware of the nuances of the language and style of the First Continuator. In consciously using similar phraseology in a context of praise, the chronicler hopes for the coming of a time that would at least be comparable to the golden age described in the narrative of the origins of Peterborough abbey.

This similarity in narrative strategy and vocabulary between the two phases of the Peterborough text (the Interpolations and First Continuation on the one hand, and the Second Continuation on the other), and the conscious scribal conformity to the earlier part of the Peterborough manuscript, indicates the compiler's awareness of the preceding part of the text. At the same time, the differences in narrative strategies call for a reassessment of the extent to which the stylistic and formal strategies of the Second Continuator echo those of his predecessor.

The Second Continuation was written about twenty years after the First Continuation, a time sufficiently long for it to be considered as a separate narrative in its own right. There is the nominal retention of the annal format, though the annal marker of the whereabouts of the king, so conspicuous as a structural parallel between the received annals and the First Continuation, is hardly sustained in the Second Continuation, and events are narrated more as a cumulative progression of cause and effect. Causality is the cornerstone of narrative progression in the Second Continuation. In annal 1135

¹⁰⁵ 'Ða was þe eorl underfangen æt Winestre 7 æt Lundene mid micel wurtscipe; 7 alle diden him manred 7 suoren þe pais to halden'. (Then was the earl received at Winchester and at London with great honour; and all did him allegiance and swore to hold the peace.)

the eulogy of Henry I is followed by an account of the accession of Stephen. Parallel clauses and the rapid succession of verbs are used as a means of narrative progression and immediacy.¹⁰⁶ The most striking example of a causal narrative progression, however, is not the famous narrative of the Anarchy in annal 1137 (where time seems to stand still in the chronicler's unrelenting account of 'horrors'), but the more low-key 1140, where the events of almost fourteen years are narrated. Even though it is far outdone by the *Gesta Stephani* as a record of complicated political manoeuvrings, its narrative immediacy is worth noting.¹⁰⁷ The logic of the narrative and the rapid changes in the political situation are emphasised by the reiteration of 'Perefter' (after that) and 'Pa' (then/ when). As has been noted earlier, this consistent use of parallel clauses to further narrative progression is also a feature of the Interpolations and the First Continuation. The grant of Wulfhere s.a. 656 in the Interpolations, the account of archiepiscopal elections in annal 1123, and the coming of Henry of Saint-Jean-d'Angély to Peterborough s.a. 1127 are only a few instances of its most effective uses. The same sure grasp of causality and narrative progression is also demonstrated by the Second Continuation.

The Second Continuator's flexible interpretation of the rigid demands of the annal structure may indicate that the annal form is no longer suitable for the way *Chronicle* narrative has evolved. However, this departure has often been held to reflect poorly on his ability as a

¹⁰⁶ This imbues the narrative with speed: 'Enmang þis was his nefe cumen to Engleland, Stephne de Blais; 7 com to Lundene; 7 te lundenisce folc him underfeng 7 senden eft̃er þe ærcebiſcop Willelm Curbuil; 7 halchede him to kinge on Midewintre Dæi.' (In the midst of this was his nephew, Stephen of Blois, come to England, and he came to London, and the people of London received him and sent after the archbishop, William Corbeil, and consecrated him as king on midwinter's day).

¹⁰⁷ Consider, for example, the following extract, which covers events after the king's capture at the Battle of Lincoln: 'Pa was al Engleland styred mar þan ær wæs; 7 al yuel wæs [i]n lande. Perefter com þe kinges dohter Henriſ, þe hefde ben emperic[e in] Almanie 7 nu wæs cuntesse in Anjou; 7 com to Lundene, 7 te lundenisse folc hire wolde tæcen, 7 scæ fleh 7 forles þar mic[el]. Perefter þe biſcop of Winceſtre, Henri þe kinges brothor Stephnes, ſpac wið Rodbert eorl 7 wyd þemperice 7 suor heom athas ðat he neure ma mid te king his brother wolde halden 7 cursede alle þe men þe mid him heoldon, 7 sæde heom ðat he uolde iuen heom up Winceſtre 7 dide heom cumen þider. Pa hi þærinne wæren, þa com þe kinges cuen mid al hire strengthe 7 besæt heom, ðat þer wæs inne micel hungær. Pa hi ne leng ne muhten þolen, þa stal[en] hi ut 7 flugen.' (Then all of England was more agitated than ever before, and all evil was in the land. After that came the daughter of King Henry, who had been the Empress in Germany and was now countess of Anjou, and came to London, and the people of London wanted to capture her, and she fled and lost/ surrendered much there. After that, the bishop of Winchester, Henry, brother of King Stephen, spoke with Earl Robert and with the Empress and swore oaths to them that he would not hold [allegiance] with the king, his brother, any more, and cursed all the men who held with him [i.e. the king], and said to them that he would give up Winchester to them, and made them come there. When they were in there [Winchester], then the king's queen came with all her forces and besieged them, so that there was great scarcity in [the town]. When they were not able to endure for long, then they stole out and fled.)

chronicler, and has led to the impression that his narrative is confused. This portion of the E text usually ranks lower in its 'literary' merits, though Clark comments on the continuing stylistic control, remarking that the 'use of word patterns is deliberate and apt'.¹⁰⁸ However, the presence of a strong logic of causation in the narrative from 1132 to 1154 has already been noted, and the chronicler also demonstrates a sense of internal parallelism and contrast, as in annals 1137 and 1154, where meaning is enhanced through narrative juxtaposition. As a structural method, this is similar to the way accounts of famines, natural disasters and crop mortality act as *topoi* in the Interpolations and the First Continuation. The repetition of words and word-fields as a mode of emphasis has already been noted as a consistent feature of the Interpolations and the First Continuation. A similar stylistic strategy also seems to be in play in annal 1135, where the repeated use of the verb 'þestrede' imaginatively associates the darkening of the sky during an eclipse with the metaphorical darkening of the country during the period of the Anarchy after Henry's death.¹⁰⁹ The imaginative association rests on the link between the eclipse, the prognostication, and the actual event of the king's death; in actuality however, though the king's death occurred in that year, the eclipse had occurred in 1133, and is noted by John of Worcester.¹¹⁰ The use of portents to mark an event of some significance is common in the copied annals, as well as in the Interpolations and the First Continuation. The Second Continuator's metaphorical linking of the barrenness of the earth with

¹⁰⁸ See Clark, ed., *The Peterborough Chronicle*, p. lxxxvi. She points out instances of inversion 'to make a point' (for example, 'God man he wes', 'a good man he was' or 'Alle he wæron forsworen' 'They were all forsworn'), the repetition of synonyms for weight and emphasis (for example, 'ofwundred 7 ofdred' 'terrified and frightened', or 'deoules 7 yuele men' 'devils and evil men'), and balance and antithesis, used as in annal 1140, to recreate the rapid changes in the political situation between Stephen and the Empress Matilda (Matilda's arrival in London and her subsequent flight, Bishop Henry's change in allegiance, and the tables turned by Stephen's queen, Matilda). For an overall survey of the rhetorical figures in the language of the Second Continuator, see Clark, ed., *The Peterborough Chronicle*, pp. lxxxiv–lxxxvii.

¹⁰⁹ 'þa þestrede þe dæi ouer al landes, 7 uuard þe sunne suilc als it uuare thre niht ald mone, an sterres abuten him at middæi. Wur\p/en men suiðe ofuundred 7 ofdred, 7 sæden ðat micel þing sculde cumen herefter; sua dide, for þat ilc gær warth þe king ded ðat oþer dæi efter Sancte Andreas massedæi on Normandi. Þa þestre sona þas landes, for æuric man sone ræude oþer þe mihte' (then the day darkened all over the land, and the sun became such as it were a three-night-old moon, and stars around it at midday. Men became very astonished and afraid, and said that a great thing should come hereafter; and so it happened, for that same year was the king dead the day after Saint Andrew's mass day in Normandy. Then immediately after the land darkened, for each man who could immediately robbed the other). An exact parallel for this reading is in *Hugh Candidus*, and the relationship between the two texts is discussed in Chapter 4, pp. 150–5.

¹¹⁰ See McGurk, ed., *The Chronicle of John of Worcester*, Vol. III, pp. 208–11. William of Malmesbury wrongly dates the year of Henry's crossing to Normandy as 1132 rather than 1133, see pp. 22–3 in King and Potter, eds, *Historia Novella*.

the sins of the people *s.a.* 1137, and the use of the eclipse to indicate by metaphor a deterioration of the state of the land after the death of the king may also be compared to the evocation of the Wild Hunt in 1127, where the black repulsive other-worldly hunters seem to imply the predatory nature of Abbot Henry. Similarly, the reiteration of 'wrecce' marks the narrative of worsening times during the Anarchy; in being consistently paired with the noun 'men', it becomes a phrase encapsulating the state of the common people during this time. As in annal 1124, economic conditions of high taxation and rising prices add weight to the context,¹¹¹ and the narrative is further intensified by the proliferation of verbs of violence and oppression: 'ræuede' (plundered/ravaged), 'suencten' (tormented), 'drapen' (destroyed), 'pined/pining' (tortured/ torturing) and associated abstract nouns: 'yfel' (evil), 'ræflac' (rapine), even a Wulfstanian 'unfrið' in annal 1135.

Despite similarities in vocabulary and the frequent use of repetition as a means of intensifying the narrative, the Second Continuator's choice of words remains somewhat different. For example, 'wrecce' was commonly used in almost all the exclamatory statements across the Interpolations and First Continuation, but in the Second Continuation, incidences of this word are concentrated only in annal 1137. Further, the Second Continuator seems to place more emphasis on words denoting corporeal material objects.¹¹² This is in no way an absolute distinction between the styles of the First and the Second Continuator, nor does it imply that the use of metaphor is absent in the narrative of the Second Continuation. Nevertheless, the First Continuator tends more towards repetition of words denoting abstract concepts: 'luve' (love), 'onsting' (authority) or 'wurðscipe' (honour).¹¹³ Even when the Wild Hunt is recounted, it involves not so much a physical description of the hunters as a use of colour to characterise them.¹¹⁴ Though the

¹¹¹ 'I ne can ne I ne mai tellen alle þe wunder ne alle þe pines ðat hi diden wrecce men on þis land ... Hi læiden gæildes o\ n/ the tunes æure um wile, 7 clepeden it tenserie. Þa þe uurecce men ne haden nammore to gyuen, þa ræueden hi 7 brendon alle the tunes ... Þa was corn dære, 7 flec 7 cæse 7 butere, for nan ne wæs o þe land. Wrecce men sturuen of hungær ...' (I neither know nor may tell of all the horrors or all the tortures that they subjected wretched men to in this land ... They laid taxes on the villages/ towns constantly all the time, and called it tenserie. When the wretched men had no more to give, then they ravaged and burned down all the villages/towns ... then corn was dear, and meat and cheese and butter, for there was not any in the land. Wretched men died of hunger).

¹¹² Note, in this context, the emphasis on the corporeal aspect of torture in 1137. See above, pp. 83–7.

¹¹³ It should be emphasised that this distinction is not always clear-cut and absolute; in 1124 the First Continuator uses the language of currency transactions to emphasise the economic situation.

¹¹⁴ 'ða huntas wæron sarte 7 micle 7 ladlice, 7 here hundes ealle swarte 7 bradegede 7 ladlice, 7 hi ridone on swarte hors 7 on swarte bucces' (The hunters were big and black and horrible, and their hounds were all black and big-eyed and horrible, and they rode on black horses and black bucks).

event is reported in detail by 'truthful men', we cannot visualise these hunters except as big, black and fearsome entities. On the other hand the Second Continuator, even when dealing with abstract ideas like peace, or justice, or oppression, associates them with physical, material objects. Security and peace is always associated with material objects like 'gold 7 sylure' or 'tresor'. In the annal for 1135, the reign of Henry I is said to have guaranteed the security of individual possessions,¹¹⁵ and in 1137, the political insecurity finds a parallel in the depletion of *tresor* by Stephen; the word denotes not an abstract idea of wealth but the actual royal treasury.¹¹⁶ There is nothing quite like this in the Peterborough text to 1131; the closest approximation would be the account of Hereward's raid *s.a.* 1070, where the cumulative list of objects taken away by the rebels becomes a measure of the loss of prestige that the abbey suffers.¹¹⁷ However, this material perspective does share much in common with the overall perspective of the later text of *Hugh Candidus*, where the material possessions of the abbey and the legality of abbey documentation (particularly those pertaining to land grants) are of paramount importance.¹¹⁸

In being associated with material objects or wealth, concepts like 'honour', 'peace' or 'justice' function as means of drawing narrative parallels between the annals of the Second Continuation. The 'pais' instituted by Henry I and the praise vocabulary of his reign¹¹⁹ may be compared with the exactly parallel language used in lauding Henry II.¹²⁰ The consistent reiteration of 'pais' or 'micel eie' brings out

¹¹⁵ '...pais he makede men 7 dær; wua sua bare his byrthen gold 7 sylure, durste nan man sei to him naht bute god.' (...he made peace for man and beast; whosoever bore his burden of gold and silver, no man dared to say anything but good [words] to him).

¹¹⁶ 'Dis gære for þe \king/ Stephne ofer sæ to Normandi 7 ther was underfangen, forþi ðat hi uuenden ðat he sculde ben alsuic alse the eom wes, 7 for he hadde get his tresor; ac he todeld it 7 scattered sotlice. Micel hadde Henri king gadered gold 7 syluer, 7 na god ne dide me for his saule tharof.' (This year King Stephen journeyed over the sea to Normandy, and was received there, because they thought/ hoped that he would also be just as his uncle was, and because he had his treasure (i.e. control of the royal treasury); but he dispersed and scattered it foolishly. Much had King Henry gathered in gold and silver, and it did not do much good for his soul.)

¹¹⁷ See Chapter 1, pp. 44–9.

¹¹⁸ See Chapter 4, pp. 155–9.

¹¹⁹ 'God man he wes, 7 micel æie wes of him: durste nan man misdon wið oðer on his time; pais he makede men 7 dær.' (He was a good man, and there was great fear/awe of him: no man dared transgress against the other in his time; he made peace for man and beast.) The association of this 'pais' with 'gold 7 sylure' has already been noted.

¹²⁰ 'Þa was þe eorl underfangen æt Wincestre 7 æt Lundene mid micel wurtscipe, 7 alle diden him manred 7 suoren þe pais to halden, 7 hit ward sone suythe god pais sua ðat neure was here. Þa was þe king strengere þanne he æuert her was, 7 te eorl ferde ouer sæ; 7 al folc him luuede, for he did god iustise 7 makede pais. [1154] Þa þe king was ded, þa was þe eorl beionde sæ, 7 ne durste nan man don oþer bute god for þe micel eie of him.' (Then was the earl received at Winchester and at London with great honour; and all did him allegiance and swore to hold the peace, and it was soon a very good peace such as was never before. Then the king was stronger than he was before, and the earl journeyed over the sea; and the people loved him, for he did good justice and

the correspondences between the reigns of the two Henrys, and the 'god iustise' of Henry II may be contrasted with the comment that King Stephen was a 'milde man ... 7 softe 7 god, 7 na iustise ne dide'. By using similar words in contexts of parallelism and contrast, the Second Continuator expresses a theme also found in other contemporary writers: that Henry II would resuscitate Anarchy-torn England.¹²¹

The investment of physical symbols with a specific set of meanings is recurrent enough in the narrative of the Second Continuation to merit mention. Words denoting objects with a corporeal identity may thus take on wider associations: the repeated use of 'castel', for example, is associated with oppressive power. As the major political dramas of the period were played out through sieges centred on castle towns, the importance of this fortification should not be underestimated.¹²² The chronicler of the Second Continuation specifically associates castles with oppression and flagrant opposition to a centralised power represented by the king.¹²³

Therefore, to sum up: despite correspondences in style with the Interpolations and the First Continuation (for example, the repetition of words for emphasis or the use of parallel clauses as a means of causal progression), there are subtle differences in the structure and narrative of the Second Continuation. Structural and formal parallels between earlier Peterborough narratives are not consistently maintained, and the annal structure is loosely and superficially used, which might imply a perceived limitation of this format. Perhaps because of the gap in time, the Second Continuation moves further away from the strong structural parallelism linking the First Continua-

made peace. [1154] When the king was dead, then the earl was beyond the sea; and no man dared to do [anything] other but good because of great fear/awe of him.)

¹²¹ Henry of Huntingdon in his *Historia Anglorum* lauds Henry by saying that 'Rex obiit, nec rege carens caret Anglia pace' (The king is dead, but kingless England lacks not peace); and the Battle Abbey chronicler notes that after the death of Stephen, 'Succedente ... inclito rege Henrico, prioris Henrici nepote, qui auita tempora renouaret' (The famous King Henry succeeded, grandson of the earlier Henry, who brought back the times of his grandfather).

¹²² About the 'notorious castles built in direct furtherance of usurpation', Charles Coulson, 'The Castles of the Anarchy', *The Anarchy of King Stephen's Reign*, ed. E. King (Oxford, 1994), pp. 67–92, notes (pp. 67–8): 'Even when instruments of violence (and its most noticed and durable symptom), castles were the result, not the cause of local disturbances. Castle-building, as one of the consequences of the juridical protection of property rights, might also measure the extent of disturbance.'

¹²³ 'Hi hadden him manred maked 7 athes suoren, ac hi nan treuthe ne heolden; alle he wæron forsworen 7 here treotthes forloren, for æuric rice man his casteles makede 7 agænes him heolden 7 fyllden þe land ful of castles. Hi suencten suyðe uurecce men of þe land mid castelweorces; þa þe castles uuaren maked, þa fyllden hi mid deoules 7 yuele men.' (They had done homage and sworn oaths to him, but they did not hold their pledge; they were all perjured and their pledges abandoned, because every powerful man made his castles and held it against him [i.e. the king]; and filled the land full of castles. They greatly oppressed the wretched men of the land with castle building; when those castles were made, then they filled them with devils and evil men.)

tion and the copied annals, where the whereabouts of the king are noted at the head of the annal as a structural formula, even though not strictly necessary for narrative causality. By contrast, in the Second Continuation, there is greater emphasis on internal parallelism and contrast, for example, in the use of similar vocabulary to compare, contrast and link the reigns of Henry I, Henry II and Stephen; or in the contrast between a country torn apart by the Anarchy and the order and security provided by the abbacy of Martin at Peterborough. The choice of vocabulary in the Second Continuation is also subtly different, with a tendency to use words emphasising the material and corporeal nature of things. Abstract concepts (like peace, justice or power) are usually associated with material objects (like wealth or castles), and the narrator demonstrates an evident curiosity in the actual instruments of torture *s.a.* 1137.

So, what does this all mean for our perception of the writing of the Peterborough text as a whole? On the one hand, the extremely close formal and narratorial links between the Interpolations and the First Continuation indicate that a single individual certainly performed the functions of author and compiler for these parts of the Peterborough text, and was possibly even the scribe who wrote the manuscript. Given the subtle differences between the formal and narrative strategies between the First and Second Continuations, there is no doubt, on the other hand, that a different compiler takes up the responsibility for the text after the span of twenty years. However, the phrasal echoes with the language of the First Continuator, as well as the use of similar stylistic strategies (the use of parallel clauses and connectives for narrative causality and progression) demonstrate this chronicler's deep awareness of the work of his predecessor. This seems to imply that, even though the Second Continuator does not always follow up the structural links made by the compiler of the first two phases of the text, there remains a conscious connection in language, style and narrative strategies with the preceding phases. Indeed, in its vindication of Peterborough abbey's ability to survive all the vagaries of fortune, the Second Continuation shares much in common with the Interpolations, which evokes, despite the disasters faced by the abbey, a golden past. The Second Continuator also draws attention to the place itself, once again secured and bound by grants and privileges, a *locus amoenus* whose fruitfulness is in contrast to the barren landscape beyond. With the Second Continuation, the fortunes of the abbey come full circle. The security provided by Abbot Martin in the face of a breakdown in law and order, or the expression of hope for a new era under a new king and a new abbot, echoes the relationship of love and bounty between Abbot Seaxwulf and his Anglo-Saxon royal patrons, or the generosity of Edgar's grant during the refoundation of the abbey under Æthelwold. This note of triumph

is noticeably absent from the First Continuation. The uncertainty regarding the future of Peterborough under Abbot Henry is evident in the melancholy tone of the earlier narrative, and the sense of contrast with the monks of Saint-Jean-d'Angély who were successful in driving out their double-dealing abbot is all too apparent. We can only presume that the relative security after the turbulent period of the Anarchy prompted a narrative which would complete the narrative of the First Continuation, and at the same time be a vindication of the abbey's continuing wealth and status.

The language and narrative of the Second Continuator leave us in no doubt that they are geared towards the specific ideological end of showing the abbey flourishing in all situations, both during the political chaos of Stephen's reign and during the more stable conditions under Henry II. The act of writing this narrative is significant, as it demonstrates a desire for textual completeness, thus indicating that this vernacular chronicle was seen as an important and integral part of the articulation of Peterborough's identity, coexisting with other texts (in alternative linguistic and generic forms) produced at around the same time. The chronicler's awareness of the nuances of the work of his predecessor, and the evocation of a past already articulated through the earlier narrative, acts as connective tissue between the phases of the Peterborough texts, even though the last phase is separated by almost twenty years from the first two. Seen as a unit, rather than as separate phases, the *Peterborough Chronicle* is a powerful expression of the abbey's origins, identity and fortunes, integrated within a document of national historiography in the vernacular.

Despite the powerful case that is made in the narrative for the abbey's ability to survive and prosper, the text itself does not survive beyond the Second Continuation. The next major work of historiography at the abbey is the Latin *Hugh Candidus*, which also draws upon alternative forms of historiography like its predecessor, in particular the origin history and diplomatic incorporated in the Interpolations.¹²⁴ The incorporation of hybrid elements forms an important aspect of vernacular and Latin historiography at Peterborough, but it is all the more significant in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, as it involves a substantial modification of the traditional annal format. This inclusion of alternative generic formats like charter and diploma within the pre-existing fabric of vernacular historiography raises a number of issues which go beyond the text itself. It draws attention to the importance of the compiler's role in the articulation of identity in medieval texts, and the complex process which brings together a number of disparate elements into

¹²⁴ The specific dynamics of text production at Peterborough in the latter half of the twelfth century are the subject of the final chapter of this study, see Chapter 4, pp. 143–71.

a coherent whole, ideologically geared to serve the interests of the community. The survey of the phases of the *Peterborough Chronicle* has already shown that its narrative not only involved negotiation with alternative forms of historiography like charters, but also with the weight of a pre-existent tradition of vernacular historiography. In all its phases, the Peterborough compilers demonstrate a deep and nuanced awareness of the preceding portions of the text. The end of the *Chronicle* as narrative (annal 1154 in the Second Continuation), and as an example of vernacular historiography, necessarily calls for a reassessment of our critical perceptions of form and genre, and the extent to which they influence the dynamics of text production at the abbey. This, in turn, is also related to wider questions of authorial intent in the context of twelfth-century historiography, especially the way in which the *Peterborough Chronicle* interacts with other contemporary texts, in particular the prolific body of Latin historiography by named and anonymous historians that was being produced in the twelfth century. It is this wider world beyond the confines of the *Peterborough Chronicle* which forms the subject of the following chapter.

Making the *Chronicle*: form, genre, identity

Compiling the past and the present

Compilation, as an editorial function, involves a balance of activities ranging from passive gathering and collation of material to the more active construction and writing of new texts, or translations from one language to another. It is as relevant to medieval times as the modern, whether it involves the production of a text from a range of source texts in the Latin or vernacular, or the translation of a source code to machine language. In a modern world which lays great emphasis on 'originality' or 'creativity', the activity of the compiler (as it does not claim to add anything new to the text) is often placed in a subservient position to that of the 'author' or the 'creator'. However, by contrast, the role of the compiler was a central one in the medieval and early modern periods, especially as it involved significant skill in ordering material derived from a range of texts and sources into a new, composite whole.¹ Compilation was elevated to a literary form, and influenced works of vernacular literature.² The compiler's arrangement of text and commentary through the concepts of *ordinatio* and *compilatio* became the means of monitoring the reader's response to the '*auctoritates*', or inherited material, and also gave rise to the scholarly apparatus which we now assume to be an integral part of a text.³ This crystallisation

¹ M. B. Parkes, 'The Influence of the Concepts of *Ordinatio* and *Compilatio* on the Development of the Book', in M. B. Parkes, *Scribes, Scripts, and Readers: Studies in the Communication, Presentation, and Dissemination of Medieval Texts* (London, 1991), pp. 35–69. For the function of the compiler, see *ibid.*, pp. 58–62.

² For example, in the *Canterbury Tales*, it almost becomes a literary stance when, in the General Prologue, Chaucer dons the garb of the compiler by claiming to add nothing of his own to the work (GP lines 727–36), *ibid.*, pp. 60–2. Also see A. J. Minnis, *Medieval Theory of Authorship: Scholastic Literary Attitudes in the Later Middle Ages* (London, 1984), pp. 190–210.

³ As Parkes notes, 'The scholarly apparatus which we now take for granted – analytical title of contents, text disposed into books, chapters, and paragraphs, and accompanied by footnotes and index – originated in the application of the notions of *ordinatio* and *compilatio* by writers, scribes and rubricators of the thirteenth fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.' See Parkes, 'The Influence of the Concepts of *Ordinatio* and *Compilatio*', p. 66.

of the compiler's role demonstrates the importance of this editorial function in the making of medieval texts.⁴

The analysis so far has focussed on the ideological and textual interplay within the *Peterborough Chronicle*. The complex procedure of amalgamating the past and the contemporary meant that the activities of the compiler, collator, translator, author and scribe frequently blurred boundaries.⁵ The process started with the acquisition of a *Chronicle* version belonging to an earlier tradition of historiography, one which had played an important part in the historiographical activity at Canterbury in the post-Conquest period. We know that this proto-E was already modified by the compiler of the F text at Canterbury, and it is significant that these modifications, additions and insertions made during a previous compilatory phase are retained rather than eliminated by the Peterborough compiler.⁶ The next stage of this process was the insertion of the narrative of Peterborough origins and history as markers of regional identity in the proto-E text. The transformation of charter to narrative, and the adaptation of diplomatic material from Latin, would certainly have involved translation and rewriting, while compiling the Interpolations and inserting them at appropriate points in the Common Stock would possibly have involved an intermediary draft stage, as the seamless integration of narrative definitely argues for such a prior ordering of material. The Interpolations and the First Continuation are unified in a close awareness of the structure and language of the received proto-E *Chronicle*, and scrupulously retain features that are part of the inherited text. The similarities in structure (the notice of the royal court placed at the start of the annal), style (the sustained use of linguistic registers), and the manipulation of narrative for effect (the disaster *topoi*) indicate that not only were the Interpolations and the First Continuation written as linked narrative, consistent with the form, function and content of the proto-E text, but also that they were the product of a single compilatory mind. This further supports the claim that the compiler of the Interpolations and the First Continuation may be identified with the scribe of the Peterborough text to 1131, as there is an exact match between

⁴ This focus on the role of the compiler in the creation of a medieval text may also have implications for the generic hybridity of the *Chronicle*, see below pp. 135–41.

⁵ This is certainly not uncommon in the production of texts and manuscripts in the twelfth century; consider, for example, William of Malmesbury's significant scribal and editorial involvement in the collection of texts for his abbey library. See R. M. Thomson, 'The "scriptorium" of William of Malmesbury', *Medieval Scribes, Manuscripts and Libraries: essays presented to N. R. Ker*, eds. M. B. Parkes and Andrew G. Watson (London, 1978), pp. 117–42.

⁶ The implications of this are discussed below, pp. 111–20.

scribal and compilatory procedures.⁷ The Second Continuation also makes use of a system of internal parallelism and contrast structurally similar to the compilatory techniques of the First Continuator, even though this portion of the text was written in retrospect twenty years or more after the end of the First Continuation.⁸ The language and structure of the Second Continuation also argue for a single compiler for the annals from 1132 to 1154, but whether that can be identified with the scribe of this section still remains conjecture.

The manuscript of the *Peterborough Chronicle* has very few textual traces of the linked compilatory and scribal activities involved in its construction. This is in marked contrast to the frequent corrections, erasures and insertions in the F version at Canterbury, which provides a window into the compilatory procedures of its scribe-compiler.⁹ The Peterborough manuscript is written from scratch, and, though showing changes in scribal hands and practices, it can only offer a partial glimpse of the total compilatory procedure followed in its preparation. Irvine notes traces of correction and change in the Interpolations, but that is not inconsistent with the general corrections made in the text overall, and the incorporation of the new and old portions of the text remains relatively seamless, particularly in comparison to the F text at Canterbury.¹⁰ In the case of the *Peterborough Chronicle* (or indeed any version of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*), the anonymous construction of the text means that there is no independent account of the author constructing a text, as there is, for example, in Eadmer's account of Anselm writing his *Proslogion*. Eadmer provides a detailed account of the process, noting that the first stage was intense meditation, followed by a rough draft of Anselm's design on wax tablets. Anselm's wax tablets were then lost in transition, and he needed to make a second draft (on wax, which were broken), and a third, this time on parchment so as to preserve it. For Anselm, all stages (including the unnecessary ones involving lost and broken wax tablets) were part of the cognitive process of writing a text and imbuing it with authority, and for the modern reader of the medieval text, they provide valuable

⁷ The presence of linked narrative and its implications for the authorship of the *Peterborough Chronicle* are discussed in Home, 'Double-edged déjà vu', pp. 67–90; see also Chapter 2, pp. 72–4.

⁸ See Chapter 2, pp. 91–9.

⁹ Baker, ed., *MS F*, pp. lxix–lxxv.

¹⁰ Irvine, ed., *MS E*, notes the presence of minor erasures in the following interpolated annals: 654 (p. 26), 656 (pp. 27–9), 675 (pp. 31–2), 686 (p. 33), 777 (p. 40), 852 a (p. 47), 963 (pp. 57–8), 1013 (p. 70), 1041 (p. 77), 1066 (p. 86; but the erasure is actually in the received annal rather than in the interpolation), 1070 (pp. 88–9), 1102 (p. 112), 1107 (p. 115, here too, as in 1066, the erasure is in the received annal rather than the interpolation), and 1114 (p. 118). The erasures become more frequent in the First Continuation, thus indicating contemporary composition and copying.

insight into the complex construction of a medieval text.¹¹ The lack of an obvious *ordinatio* in the layout of the *Peterborough Chronicle*, or the absence of self reflexivity in indicating the process of composition and compilation, does not mean that the process of compiling this text was any less complicated than Anselm's *Proslogion*. Indeed, Eadmer's account lays bare the many stages that may lie behind the final version of a text, and we can assume that the act of compilation, particularly for a multi-layered text such as the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, would have been even more complicated. The range of diplomatic texts translated and adapted by the Peterborough compiler, or the volume of source texts accessed by the compiler of F at Canterbury, certainly makes it very likely that a number of complex compilatory procedures were involved in their construction.¹² The sheer effort that went into the production of the *Chronicle* in the twelfth century, in turn, indicates its importance as an example of historiography in the vernacular amongst the contemporary formats of cartulary, chronicle-cartulary and house-history in Latin.

The internal mechanisms of the *Chronicle* at Peterborough, and the careful balancing of the new and old portions of the text so as to achieve a seamless narrative of local and national history, are crucial to our understanding of how the text was constructed. However, to place the writing of this medieval text in its proper context, we also need to look beyond the *Chronicle* at Peterborough, and the perspective of the established genre of vernacular historiography that it represents. It is therefore important not only to look within the text and analyse its narrative strategy and ideology (as the preceding chapters have done), but also to look outside it, and consider what the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* may have meant not just for text production at Peterborough, but for the writing of twelfth-century historiography in general. These themes and issues need to be drawn together before moving on to a consideration of how (and why) this vernacular *Chronicle* gives way to the production of local historiography in Latin at Peterborough in the second half of the twelfth century.

The analysis in this chapter will look at both internal and external relationships involving the *Chronicle*; it is divided into four sections, each representing such a relationship. Though seemingly separate, they are all connected through the way in which they contribute to our understanding of the processes behind the construction of the *Chronicle* at Peterborough, its importance as an example of vernacular historiography, and its relation to the writing of historiography in the

¹¹ Mary Carruthers, *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture* (Cambridge, 1990), pp. 211–12.

¹² For the diplomatic sources used by the compiler of E, see Chapter 1, pp. 29–42; for the sources used by the compiler of F see Baker, ed., *MS F*, pp. xxviii–lxii.

twelfth century. The initial focus will be on internal relationships – on the scribal activity centred around the *Peterborough Chronicle*, and what that may tell us about text production at Peterborough. However, text production at Peterborough was also part of a much larger network of textual relationships, which can be traced back to historiography produced at post-Conquest Canterbury. The second section therefore explores the links between Peterborough and Canterbury, and assesses the extent to which the writing of the *Chronicle* at Peterborough may have been influenced by historiographical activity at Canterbury.

The link with Canterbury opens up a wider window regarding the dissemination and use of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* in the twelfth century. As the last complete version of the *Chronicle*, the *Peterborough Chronicle* is usually considered to be the last gasp of vernacular historiography. However, a closer look at the actual circumstances of the text's production indicates that this is actually a simplistic view, as not only does the text exist within a thriving output of historiography at Peterborough, but there is also ample proof that versions of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* were used by a wider network of historians. These external links between the proto-E or E text and contemporary Latin histories is the next relationship to be analysed, one which focuses on the status of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* as a source text in the twelfth century.

The final section brings us back to the balancing act of the Peterborough text, relying heavily on a traditional mode of historiography, yet also modifying this tradition to suit the ideological and textual requirements of a community. This section will approach the internal dynamics of the text from the perspective of generic categories and genre theory. It will draw attention to the paradoxical ability of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* to use features associated with an earlier tradition of historiography, and yet push generic boundaries further through the use of alternative formats like charter and diplomatic. This perspective of generic mutation will be instrumental in evaluating why, despite this significant output of vernacular historiography at Peterborough, the *Chronicle* ultimately gave way to alternative house-histories and chronicle-cartularies in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. This relation between the *Peterborough Chronicle* and later abbey historiography forms the subject of the next and final chapter.

Internal liaisons: scribes and the Peterborough Chronicle

The scribal characteristics of a text constitute the most basic element of its identity, and are a visible representation of the act of construction. Much work has already been done on the scribal features of Laud Misc 636, the extant manuscript of the *Peterborough Chronicle*. To sum

up, the manuscript of the *Peterborough Chronicle* up to 1154 is written by two main scribal hands, the first of them writing the major part of the manuscript. This first scribal hand is responsible for both the Interpolations up to 1121 and the First Continuation up to 1131, while the second hand writes the Second Continuation in a single block up to 1154. There remains little to be added to the extremely detailed descriptions of the scribal features of the text in existing critical scholarship.¹³ This will form the basis of the more interpretative focus of this analysis, which will discuss what the scribal evidence may mean for our perception of the text as a whole, and the circumstances in which it was written.

It has already been suggested that the first scribe of the manuscript was also the author and compiler of the *Peterborough Chronicle* till 1131. This implies, significantly, that the first two phases of the *Chronicle* were produced by a single author. The copying of the manuscript involved the interpolation of the abbey's origin history into the Common Stock portion of the proto-E. It also involved the modification of the eleventh- and twelfth-century annals to insert information relevant to the abbey, and, most importantly, constructing the Interpolations and the First Continuation as linked narrative demonstrating an ideological focus on the fortunes of Peterborough abbey. Internal evidence shows that the narrative of the Interpolations and the First Continuation of the *Peterborough Chronicle* is carefully crafted so as to echo and cross-reference formal and stylistic features, and that there is an almost exact parallel between the scribal stints and compilatory phases of the text. The second scribe takes up the responsibility of the manuscript a good twenty years after the work of the first scribe/compiler, and the clean break in the work of copying the manuscript, as well as the differences in compilatory and narrative styles, indicate that we have here a new compiler as well. The appearance of the second scribal hand certainly shows an attempt to maintain the uniformity of the appearance of the manuscript, and it has been suggested that he may have been imitating the general appearance of the former scribe.¹⁴ However, any possible collaboration between the phases of the Peterborough text would need to be placed in the context of the production and/or use of texts at the abbey.

M. R. James's list of the manuscripts formerly in the library of Peterborough abbey demonstrates that the holdings of the abbey

¹³ For a description of the hands, see Irvine, ed., *MS E*, pp. xviii–xxiii, and Whitelock, *Peterborough Chronicle*, pp. 14–20. See also Orietta Da Rold, 'Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud Misc. 636', in *The Production and Use of English Manuscripts 1060 to 1220*, Orietta Da Rold, Takako Kato, Mary Swan and Elaine Treharne, eds. (University of Leicester, 2010), available at <http://www.le.ac.uk/ee/em1060to1220>, (accessed 19/03/2014), and the extensive bibliography cited.

¹⁴ See Whitelock, *Peterborough Chronicle*, p. 17, and Irvine, ed., *MS E*, pp. xxii–xxiii.

library were significantly larger than the manuscripts extant today. James's list is based on a number of sources, one of which is the list of gifts by Bishop Æthelwold to *Medeshamstede*, now extant as part of the *Liber Niger*.¹⁵ He also draws on the *Matricularium*, a catalogue containing entries of '346 separate volumes'. However, he does not consider the *Matricularium* to be the official catalogue of the abbey, suggesting that the compiler intended 'to record the smaller and subsidiary contents of the volumes in the library, omitting the long treatises', which in turn may indicate that it was for private use.¹⁶ James notes that a number of works which form the standard contents of most monastic libraries are missing from this catalogue,¹⁷ and this is also the case for the Peterborough version of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, which, though 'undoubtedly written in the abbey' has no visible features which link it to the library at Peterborough.¹⁸ There is also a partial second surviving catalogue, now Oxford, Bodley MS 163, fol. 251r, probably written between 1116 and 1119, which may have been a list of texts which survived the fire.¹⁹ The partial evidence of extant Peterborough texts and catalogues suggests that the library was much larger than we have concrete evidence for, and presumably the abbey's books suffered greatly during the Dissolution and the Civil War.²⁰ This (implied) presence of a reasonably large library at the abbey also argues for the existence of a scriptorium at Peterborough, and this is also supported by the presence of the two hands of the *Peterborough Chronicle* in other texts which can be associated with the abbey. The scribe of the Interpolations and the First Continuation has been associated with the scribal hand of Harley 3667 and Cotton Tiberius C i (ff. 2–42), both originally parts of the same manuscript, thus suggesting that all these manuscripts were 'produced in the same scriptorium as the *Peterborough Chronicle*'.²¹ Clark makes the link between the scribal hands explicit, and notes remarkable similarities between the vernacular annotation in Harley 3667 and the hand of the *Peterborough Chronicle*.²² The second hand of the *Peterborough Chronicle* makes corrections in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 134

¹⁵ For a complete list of these sources, see M. R. James, 'Lists of Manuscripts Formerly in Peterborough Abbey Library', *Supplement to the Transactions of the Bibliographical Society* 5 (Oxford, 1926), pp. 7–9.

¹⁶ '[T]he format and material of the book suggest that it can hardly be the official catalogue drawn up for use in the library.' *Ibid.*, p. 9.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 10–12.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

¹⁹ See Karsten Friis-Jensen and James M. W. Willoughby, ed., *Peterborough Abbey, Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues* 8 (London, 2001), pp. xxvi and xxx.

²⁰ If the *Matricularium*, as a brief catalogue, contains 346 items, we can logically assume that the formal catalogue would have recorded holdings of far greater size and range.

²¹ See Da Rold, 'Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud Misc. 636'. Also see Ker, *Catalogue*, 346, pp. 424–6, for an earlier description.

²² See Clark, ed., *The Peterborough Chronicle*, p. xvii.

(Berengaudus, an exposition of the seven visions of the Apocalypse), and even more importantly, is also the hand which writes folios 6–71 of the *Liber Niger* (now London, Society of Antiquaries, MS 60), the abbey's earliest cartulary.

These scribal associations, though limited in their scope by the paucity of extant Peterborough manuscripts, provide pointers to the process of rewriting the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* at the centre. For one, both scribes are associated with historiographical or quasi-historiographical activity of some kind, other than their association with the *Peterborough Chronicle*.²³ The vernacular insertion made by the first scribal hand of the *Peterborough Chronicle* in Harley 3667 occurs on the margins of an Easter table, though the manuscript itself is part of a larger scientific manuscript, now the Cotton Tiberius C i.²⁴ The second scribal hand's associations are even more significant, as the *Liber Niger*, incorporating the *Relatio Heddae*, was the first cartulary produced by the abbey, and it seems to have been produced contemporaneously with the *Peterborough Chronicle*. This scribe's writing of the *Relatio Heddae* is particularly significant for the *Peterborough Chronicle*. As a proto house-history produced by the abbey, it may have pre-dated the writing of the E text, as the narrative in the *Chronicle* tells the story of ancient documents being found in the ruined abbey walls. The existence of this Latin text is thus contextualised and reaffirmed, and (though this is not the only function of the *Peterborough Chronicle*) it is the vernacular text which suggests that the *Relatio* constitutes 'evidence' of the abbey's ancient rights and privileges. We also know that many of these charters (some of which formed part of the *Relatio*), as well as other documentation pertaining to the abbey, were used by the first scribe/compiler of the E text to construct a significant part of the Interpolations. The first compiler's incorporation of these early charters as a speech act in the narrative indicates an awareness of the form and function of a diploma. This, in turn, suggests the possibility of collaboration between the scribe/compiler of the first phase of the E text and the compiler of the *Liber Niger*. The *Chronicle* not only shares documentation with both the *Relatio* and the *Liber Niger*, but

²³ Historiography forms a surprising percentage of extant Peterborough manuscripts. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 163, an eleventh-century manuscript containing Caedmon's hymn on the margins of Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica*, and British Library Stowe 57, a twelfth-century text containing a Latin World History in mixed verse and prose, may also have had a Peterborough provenance. See Owen Roberson, 'Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 163', and Mary Swan and Owen Roberson, 'London, British Library, Stowe 57', in *The Production and Use of English Manuscripts 1060 to 1220*, ed. Da Rold *et al.* Also see Ker, *Catalogue*, 304, p. 358 and 272, p. 337.

²⁴ Hollie Morgan, 'London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius C.i' and 'London, British Library, Harley 3667', in *The Production and Use of English Manuscripts 1060 to 1220*, ed. Da Rold *et al.* Also see Ker, *Catalogue*, 196, pp. 259–60 and Cecily Clark, 'Notes on MS. Laud Misc. 636', *Medium Aevum* 23 (1954), 71–5.

it also serves to validate the contents of these texts, both directly (in the narrative of the discovery of ancient documents written by Abbot Hedda) and indirectly (in the awareness of legal forms and linguistic registers while incorporating charter material). At the very least, all this suggests that there was a busy scriptorium at Peterborough, where different projects were worked on in parallel, with the scribes and compilers of both Latin and vernacular projects sharing relevant documentation and material. If the scribe of the *Liber Niger* is considered part of this comprehensive programme of text production where abbey history is re-used and re-interpreted in various historical texts, it is also not illogical to assume that this association may have made him particularly suitable to take on the scribal responsibility (if not that of compilation as well) of writing the Second Continuation of the *Chronicle*, finishing what his earlier collaborator had begun.²⁵ Both scribes are also associated with other textual activity in Latin. This would have been especially relevant for the first compiler of the *Chronicle*, as incorporating the Latin charters would have involved translation and modification, and the compiler's proficiency in Latin would have been particularly important in this regard.

On the one hand, the need to duplicate and validate Peterborough charters which were also present in parallel (in the *Liber Niger* and the *Relatio Heddae*) within the established tradition of vernacular historiography indicates that the process of adapting the *Chronicle* was a significant historiographical endeavour. Though we have only two scribes responsible overall for the *Chronicle* (and indeed, only one at a time), this is not unusual in the writing of the *Chronicle* in the post-Conquest period, and is paralleled by the writing of the near contemporary F text at Canterbury. The care with which the manuscript is produced (particularly if we compare the neatness of this manuscript with the extant F version, for example),²⁶ indicates a high level of professionalism, and the significant compilatory effort involved in linking the narrative in all three phases indicates a high level of commitment. The generous margins left around the text (enough to write a version of the *Brut* later in the thirteenth century) also indicate that resources were lavished on this endeavour. The specific set of skills required for this project were more than adequately met by the first scribe/compiler, and later by the person chosen to continue it after twenty years, but the limited number of personnel might suggest that the availability of people with such skills

²⁵ See Chapter 2, pp. 91–9 for a detailed analysis of how the Second Continuation interacts with the narrative of his predecessor.

²⁶ For images of the manuscript of the F version, see the facsimile published as part of the Collaborative Edition (Dumville, ed., *MS. F, Facsimile Edition*). For the implications of this editorial untidiness for the elaborate construction of the manuscript, see Baker, ed., *MS. F*, pp. lxi–lxxi.

was restricted to a few members of the community. This could be one part of a complex amalgam of factors resulting in the replacement of vernacular historiography at the abbey by the Latin narrative of *Hugh Candidus*, an aspect which is explored in far greater detail in the next chapter.²⁷

The scribal characteristics of the *Peterborough Chronicle* therefore indicate more than just the way the manuscript was written. They provide some measure of the context in which this version of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* was produced in the twelfth century. The construction of the manuscript draws attention to the specific skills needed in order to amalgamate national and local history, and these possibly played an important role in the continuation of the *Chronicle* during the latter half of the twelfth century. The neatness of the manuscript indicates the care with which the text was produced, which, in turn, implies that the *Chronicle* was an important part of the many historiographical endeavours at the abbey, even though the text does not make its appearance in the extant catalogues of Peterborough abbey. The scribal links with other Peterborough manuscripts demonstrate an interest in various forms of history writing, and the extant book lists indicate the presence of Easter tables, cartularies, and house-histories.²⁸ This, in turn, demonstrates an awareness of historiographical forms, and the ways in which they could be deployed in various texts. This would have been particularly relevant for the incorporation of alternative generic formats (charter and diploma) within the traditional annalistic format of the *Chronicle*, and has further implications for our critical awareness of form and genre within the text.²⁹ Overall, the scribal evidence of the *Peterborough Chronicle* points towards a concerted programme of historiographical activity at the centre, involving the construction of two house histories (the *Relatio*, and the later text of *Hugh Candidus*), a version of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, and a cartulary (the *Liber Niger*). Though not on the scale of the activity at post-Conquest Canterbury, the construction of the *Chronicle* at Peterborough in the twelfth century parallels the compilatory processes of its earlier stage. This has further implications for the transmission and use of the *Chronicle*, as it raises the possibility that the writing of the *Chronicle* at Peterborough may have been influenced by its links with Canterbury. This forms the subject of the following section.

²⁷ This forms the subject of the final chapter of this study, see Chapter 4, pp. 143–71.

²⁸ If we consider the partial list in Bodley MS 163, fol. 251r, to be a list of books which survived the fire of 1116, a number of historical tracts, including Bede, Eusebius, Freulf and Cassiodorus may have survived, pointing to an existing collection of historiography at Peterborough. See items 7, 8, 9, 20, 40, 44 and 47 in the list provided in Friis-Jensen and Willoughby ed., *Peterborough Abbey*, pp. 6–15.

²⁹ See below, pp. 135–41.

The sense of a purpose: authorial attitudes

The bedrock of the *Peterborough Chronicle* was a version of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* that is most likely to have reached Peterborough via Canterbury, even though the unlocalised annals 1062–1121 do not allow us to draw a definite direct line of transmission. There are, however, a number of factors which support this link between the *Chronicle* versions produced at these two centres. On a textual level, there is the level of intervention in the proto-E text made by the compiler of the F version at Canterbury, though this is much less in comparison to the changes made by the same compiler in the A version of the *Chronicle*.³⁰ There is also a link in personnel between the two centres through Ernulf, prior of Canterbury, and later much loved abbot of Peterborough.³¹ However, the connection between Canterbury and Peterborough seems to be more complex than a simple case of text transmission from one centre to another. The links between the centres, particularly with regard to the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, may involve not just the use of similar archival material, but the possible importation of a whole compilatory and authorial stance.

Pope Agatho's Bull *s.a.* 675 in the *Peterborough Chronicle*, while claiming unprecedented privileges for the abbey, makes a strange exception. While Peterborough is freed from the interference of the diocesan bishop, it remains subject to the jurisdiction of the archbishop of Canterbury.³² This concession seems to be an indication of the politics of the moment, as the bull may have been constructed in the context of the volume of forged diplomatic produced during the primacy controversy between York and Canterbury.³³ In the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries Peterborough abbey undertook a campaign to obtain exemption from its diocesan bishop. Peterborough was located in the diocese of Lincoln, claimed by York, and it is possible that this papal bull was constructed as 'evidence' of the abbey's freedom from diocesan intervention and its ancient association with Canterbury.³⁴ A further link with Canterbury is that the Latin charter at Peterborough was based on a genuine bull of Pope John XII from St Augustine's, Canterbury,³⁵ which has been cited as a connection between Peterbor-

³⁰ Irvine notes that the interventions made in the A text by the F scribe are closer to E, and errors in A's common stock were corrected in comparison to the proto-E. See Irvine, ed., *MS E*, pp. xlvii–l.

³¹ See annals 1107 and 1114 E, *ibid.*, p. 115 and p. 117.

³² See Chapter 1, pp. 36–7, for a discussion of this interpolation.

³³ See Paxton, 'Charter and Chronicle', p. 80.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 68.

³⁵ However, it remains possible the Bull of Pope Agatho, though a forgery, may have been based on some previous written record. The forms of the place names are certainly older than the twelfth century, and the bounds (in similar format in both vernacular and

ough and Canterbury.³⁶ This relation between the genuine bull of Pope John XII and the forged bull of Agatho made Levison posit that the Bull of Pope Agatho was forged by Guerno, or someone who knew this forger's work well.³⁷ Kelly, however, notes that the attribution of all forgeries to Guerno would give him an unduly long career, though the papal bull of John XII can be dated to around the same time as the famous *Bulla Plumbea* of St Augustine's, 'the most complete manifesto of the claims of the St Augustine's community to total independence from all archiepiscopal and royal control'.³⁸ A document of independence supposedly granted by St Augustine, the founder of the monastery, combined with a papal bull ratifying it, forms a neat parallel to the Grant of King Wulfhere and the Bull of Pope Agatho at Peterborough. Certainly, both monasteries had similar concerns regarding the limits of ecclesiastical power and authority in the post-Conquest period, but it may also imply a deeper and closer connection between the writing of the *Chronicle* at Canterbury and Peterborough. Therefore, a fundamental question needs to be asked here – did the writing of the F version of the *Chronicle* at Canterbury influence, in some way, Peterborough's version of the *Chronicle*?

Dumville has suggested that Christ Church, Canterbury, was 'something of an academic clearing-house' in the late eleventh century, when almost every version of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* landed up there.³⁹ Paxton therefore claims that it was not unusual that a forgery from St Augustine's should become associated with a *Chronicle* version from Christ Church.⁴⁰ In the case of Peterborough, it is the fire of 1116 that has been hailed as the cause which sparked the acquisition of a *Chronicle* text, rather than a link with Canterbury. However, this story may actually be a smoke screen, and needs to be treated with caution, as the Canterbury influences in the case of

Latin versions) certainly do not represent the holdings of the monastery at the time the annals were being composed; see F. M. Stenton, 'Medeshamstede and Its Colonies', in *Historical Essays in Honour of James Tait*, ed. J. G. Edwards, V. H. Galbraith and E. F. Jacob (Manchester, 1933), pp. 313–26.

³⁶ 'The important point ... [is] the fact that there was a connection between a forgery from St. Augustine's and a chronicle text from Christ Church, since the two Canterbury houses were fierce rivals, but by the end of the eleventh century, Christ Church was assembling chronicle texts from all over England ..., so the charter may have come to Peterborough via Christ Church just as the exemplar of the E Chronicle did.' See Paxton, 'Forging Communities', p. 107.

³⁷ W. Levison, *England and the Continent* (Oxford, 1966), pp. 200–1.

³⁸ See S. E. Kelly, ed., *Charters of St. Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury and Minster-in-Thanel*, *Anglo-Saxon Charters* 4 (Oxford, 1995), pp. 21–2. For the text of the *Bella Plumbea*, see *ibid.*, pp. 19–20. The Bull of Pope John XII is printed as BCS 916.

³⁹ Dumville, 'Some Aspects', p. 38.

⁴⁰ Paxton, 'Forging Communities', p. 107. A movement in diplomatic is also evidenced by the presence of a charter of William I dated 1072 on fol. 56v of the *Liber Niger*. This is a confirmation by the Conqueror regarding the primacy of Canterbury, and is likely to have come from that centre.

the diplomatic 'borrowings' imply that text exchanges between the two centres preceded the fire. Paxton suggests that the exchange of diplomatic and historiographical texts between the two centres was made possible by Ernulf, who became abbot of Peterborough in 1107, and was 'the conduit for the transfer of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* and the forged bull of Pope Agatho'.⁴¹ There are pointers towards traffic in diplomatic documents from Canterbury to Peterborough – a writ of William I relating to the primacy dispute occurs on folio 56v of the *Liber Niger*, and Peterborough suspiciously remains subject to the jurisdiction of the archbishop of Canterbury in the Bull of Pope Vitalian summarised *s.a.* 656 following Wulfhere's grant, as in the Bull of Agatho.⁴² However, resemblances in the construction of the charters, while pointing to a connection between the two centres, may also be due to a similarity of circumstance, and do not necessarily imply the direct influence of one centre over another in the production of a version of the *Chronicle*. Gransden, for example, notes that such forged diplomatic texts often resorted to an imitation of events narrated in other diplomatic texts; a forged charter could resemble another without being physically derived from it.⁴³ We also do not know whether the Peterborough compiler ever had direct access to a copy of version F. It is not impossible if we assume Ernulf's involvement in the transfer of diplomatic and historiographical forms or templates, but there is no definitive evidence for this. It is logical to assume that Peterborough would at least have been aware of the extent of historiographical activity at Canterbury, but we would need to look beyond the diplomatic texts to discern deeper links between the chronicling activity at the two centres.

Because the F text is consistently bilingual,⁴⁴ and the E text has always been hailed as a late vernacular 'living' *Chronicle*,⁴⁵ the similarity of the circumstances in which both versions were constructed at their respective centres has never really been emphasised. Critical assumptions are made about the eye-witness quality of one text (the *Peterborough Chronicle*), and the linguistic separateness of the other (the F text). However, as a survey of the *Chronicle* tradition reveals, it is the survival of the Peterborough text, rather than its actual construction, that has imbued it with such a formidable reputation.⁴⁶ Both centres

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 107–8.

⁴² See Irvine, ed., *MS E*, p. 29.

⁴³ Gransden, 'Traditionalism and Continuity', pp. 159–207, particularly pp. 163–4.

⁴⁴ However, as noted by Dumville (D. N. Dumville, 'A Bilingual English/Latin Chronicle Written around AD 1100', *Fedorov Readings* (2000), p. 125) the F text is unique amongst the bilingual translation-texts in ordering its English annals at the head of the Latin annals, and he therefore considers English to be the 'authoritative language' of the text.

⁴⁵ See for example, Gransden, *Historical Writing in England*, p. 92.

⁴⁶ See Introduction, pp. 1–5.

chose as the base text of their *Chronicle* a version of the Northern Recension, which accounts for some of the textual correspondences between the relevant portions of the E and F texts. Further, despite the perceived separateness of Latin and vernacular texts, even a preliminary glance makes a basic resemblance between these versions apparent. For one, both texts unashamedly serve the interests of their respective communities. Both also inscribe the local history of their centre by using material derived from charters. The charters used by the E text and the way they present their claims to authority have already been analysed in detail. Likewise, from the extant state of the F version, we can see that the compiler inserts at least four documents into his text: a grant of privileges by Wihtred, king of Kent, at 694; a grant by Æthelbald, king of Mercia, at 742 confirming Wihtred's grant; a decree by Archbishop Æthelheard *s.a.* 796 citing papal privileges stating that ecclesiastical establishments could not be subject to heads who were laymen;⁴⁷ and *s.a.* 1029, Cnut's grant of rights at Sandwich to Christ Church.

The F text also shares with E a tendency to write the grant as a speech act, deriving this from the diploma form of the Latin charter.⁴⁸ The survey of the Peterborough Interpolations has already drawn attention to the use of words relating to speech and inscription to convey the power and authority of the grant. The charter is also located in a narrative present, which conveys with immediacy the relationship of concord that the abbey presumably shared with royalty in the Anglo-Saxon past. However, the documents in the F text do not use narrative strategies to the extent used by the compiler of E. To take an example, King Wihtred's grant at 694 seems to be similar to the incorporation of diplomatic in the E text, being constructed as an oral act,⁴⁹ but it remains more concerned with particulars – the respective rights of the king and the archbishop, and the demarcation of secular

⁴⁷ These documents relate to the ninth-century investiture controversy between the archbishops of Canterbury and the Mercian overlords of Kent, regarding the power to appoint abbots and abbesses. This is dealt with in detail by Brooks, *Early History of the Church of Canterbury*, pp. 175–206.

⁴⁸ For the text of the charters in F, see Baker, ed., *MS F*, pp. 40–4, 49–50, 56–7, and 113–14. For the implications of the diploma form in monastic charters, see Galbraith, 'Monastic Foundation Charters', pp. 205–22; for the importance of this in the E text see Chapter 1, pp. 29–42.

⁴⁹ 'Nu agann se cing to specende '7 sæde: ' "Ic wylle þæt ealle ða mynstra 7 ða cyrican, þa wæron giuene 7 becweðene Gode to wyrðmynte be 'ge'fulra cinga dagan minra forengengan 7 be minra magon dagon be Ægelberhtes cinges 7 þara ðe him æfterfyligdan, swa beliuian Gode to wurðmynte 7 fæstlice standan a to ecnesse æure ma"' (Now the king began to speak and said, 'I desire that all of the monastery and the church which were given and promised to honour God totally, during the days of the kings who were my predecessors, and during the days of my descendants, during [the days] of King Ethelbert and those who are his descendants, be left to honour God and be securely established ever more, always till eternity').

and the ecclesiastical domains, rather than building up a consistent linguistic register as in the case of the Peterborough text.⁵⁰ There is the same fallacy of royal power granting the church freedom from itself but, unlike the entries in E, the king's speech does not interact with the other characters in the narrative in the way the Peterborough text reports a dialogue between Wulfhere and Seaxwulf.⁵¹ The Old English part of the annal in F ends with an emphasis on secular and ecclesiastical appointment rights, and we have to refer to the Latin portion of the entry for the excommunication and the witnesses.⁵² On the other hand, the Peterborough compiler shows a masterful grasp of content and context in his transmutation of the diplomatic texts into narrative.

In some cases, it seems that the vernacular translations in the F text were made after the Latin text was inserted, as perhaps in 742, where a reference mark after the Old English portion may indicate that the translation of the Latin was on a separate sheet which is now lost.⁵³ Part of the Old English portion of 1029 also seems to have been written on the bottom margin, which was partly cut off by a binder and mutilated by the application of reagent.⁵⁴ However, the Latin charters in F can be traced back more certainly to the archival documentation from which they derive, and 'originals' of the diplomatic texts made use of by the compiler of F are available for comparison.⁵⁵ The same cannot be said for the charters in the E text which, though derived from the Latin documents now extant in the *Relatio Heddae*, cannot

⁵⁰ 'Asece `se' arcebiscop <his lif> 7 his clænnesse 7 an ane wisan ne wurþe gecoræn nan, na to swa gedonan ðingan gehalgod, butan þæs arcebiscopes ræde. Cyngas sceolan settan eorlas 7 eald(o)rmen, scirireuan 7 domesmenn, 7 se arcebiscop sceal Godes gelaðunge wissian 7 rædan `7 biscopas' 7 abbodas 7 abbedessan, priostas 7 diaconas ceosan 7 settan, halgian 7 getryman mid godan mynegunga 7 'fore'bysene' ([He] should seek out the archbishop for [the sake of] his life and [moral] cleanness, and no one should be ordained in any way, nor cause consecration of any thing, without the archbishop's counsel. Kings should appoint earls and ealdormen, shire-reeves and judges, and the archbishop shall lead and counsel God's congregation, and appoint bishops and abbots and abbesses, choose and appoint priests and deacons, consecrate and comfort with good exhortation and example).

⁵¹ In this case, 'se arcebiscop `of Cantuarebyri' Brihtwald 7 se biscop Tobias of Hrouceastre, 7 mid heom abbodas 7 abbedessen, and manige wise menn' (Brihtwald, the archbishop of Canterbury, and the bishop Tobias of Rochester and the abbots and abbesses with them and many wise men). For the Peterborough charter, see analysis of this annal in Chapter 1, pp. 30–7.

⁵² See Baker, ed., *MS F*, pp. 40–1.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 49.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 113.

⁵⁵ The text at 694 is S 20, and derived from BCS 91 and no. 7 in the Christ Church cartulary; the grant *s.a.* 742 is S 90, the longer version is BCS 162, the shorter version BCS 162 A; 796 occurs in BCS 312 and no. 14 in the Christ Church cartulary, 1029 exists in numerous texts all noted under S 959. For the Christ Church cartulary, see R. Fleming, 'Christ Church Canterbury's Anglo-Norman Cartulary', in *Anglo-Norman Political Culture and the Twelfth-Century Renaissance: Proceedings of the Borchard Conference on Anglo-Norman History*, 1995, ed. C. W. Hollister (Woodbridge, 1997), pp. 83–155. Also see Baker, ed., *MS F*, pp. lvii–lviii.

be compared directly with the Latin 'originals' in anything beyond the bounds and the witness list, as the texts have been transformed through translation. Therefore, in comparison to the compiler of E, the compiler of F was greatly concerned about the fullness of his Latin diplomatic texts, perhaps seeing their completeness as a valid source of authority. Sometimes he compared two versions of the same charter, as in 694, first copying a single sheet version, and then revising his text against the cartulary version.⁵⁶ Because the exemplars of these diplomatic texts are extant, we can note the substantial changes made by the compiler in his text. The version of Wihtred's grant (*s.a.* 694) in the F text, corroborated by the later version in the Christ Church cartulary, asserts that 'the archbishop, not the bishop, is to appoint successors not only to abbots and abbesses, but also to bishops', a reading also reflected in the Old English annal. The original ninth-century forgery on which the F scribe based his first draft of annal 694 is not so specific in noting the archbishop's rights in governing his church.⁵⁷ Such corroborative evidence is more difficult to find in case of the documents in the E text. The Latin charters of the *Relatio* or *Liber Niger* never match their vernacular derivatives exactly, even though the Peterborough compiler is remarkably accurate when it comes to transcribing the bounds and witness lists. The authority of the diplomatic insertions in E is conveyed through repetition and emphasis in the narrative itself, using words relating to speech and writing. In the Peterborough text, the concern with narrative remains uppermost, and any references to external diplomatic sources for validation are implied rather than explicit.⁵⁸

All this may well be the result of a difference in emphasis, caused by the individual characteristics of the compilers at the two centres. Both modified *Chronicle* versions are certainly united in exhibiting absolute loyalty to the centre at which they are based. While the E text is rewritten to incorporate Peterborough history and interests, the F text is also a radical rewriting in its own right.⁵⁹ We do not know in what form the compiler of F had his exemplar,⁶⁰ but the modifica-

⁵⁶ The version of the charter [S 20] originally copied by the F scribe is printed as BCS 91; the text he revised it against is no. 7 in Fleming, 'Christ Church Canterbury's Anglo-Norman Cartulary'.

⁵⁷ See Baker, ed., *MS F*, pp. lxxvi–lxxviii.

⁵⁸ As perhaps, in the events leading up to King Edgar's grant *s.a.* 963, where reference is made to old documents found in the abbey walls, almost certainly the *Relatio Heddae*.

⁵⁹ For the editorial strategies of the F scribe, and his authorial intent, see Alice Jorgensen, 'Rewriting the Æthelredian Chronicle: Narrative Style and Identity in Anglo-Saxon Chronicle MS F', *Reading the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, ed. Alice Jorgensen, *Studies in the Early Middle Ages* 23 (Turnhout, 2010), pp. 113–38. Jorgensen focuses on the annal block 983–1016 CDE, and demonstrates the way in which the F compiler's narrative is determined by his editorial choices in the text.

⁶⁰ He may have had both the A and the proto-E versions before him when he compiled his composite text, or an already compiled composite exemplar. Baker considers the first

tions made in his text reveal his definite bias towards ecclesiastical matters. Besides the changes to the inserted charter documents, 870 F also contains the anachronistic assertion that Æthelred, the successor of Archbishop Ceolnith, had been bishop of Wiltshire, a diocese not created until c. 909. The annal also emphasises the continuity of a monastic community at Christ Church, though charters reveal that secular clerics were present in the community even during the first decade of the ninth century.⁶¹ Similarly, annal 1050 notes that Archbishop Robert refused to consecrate Spearhafoc, chosen by Edward the Confessor to be bishop of London, on the orders of the pope. This incident is noted only in 1048 E, and is very likely to have been inserted into the proto-E by the F scribe.⁶²

This rewriting of local history by the F scribe so as to serve the partisan interests of his community is certainly comparable to similar narratives in the E text. The Peterborough compiler shares the F scribe's concern with the monastic structure of the community, and the diplomatic texts assert the presence of a monastic community at *Medeshamstede* before the destruction of the abbey by the Viking army.⁶³ Æthelwold's re-establishment of *Medeshamstede* merely restores this community, claiming to strengthen the monastic rule that existed there before, even though the actual nature of the Peterborough archive indicates secularisation.⁶⁴ However, despite the sustained focus on the continued presence of monastic rule, the techniques of the Peterborough compiler are more subtle in comparison to the aggressive rewriting of history in the F text. The First Compiler of the E text was remarkably conscious regarding the narrative context, making clever use of the features of the received text and the narrative structure and language of the Interpolations.

Indeed, it is this nuanced compilation of the old and the new in the E text that brings us to the most significant compilatory link between the *Chronicle* versions at Canterbury and Peterborough. Like the compiler of F, who used the various sources in front of him to produce a totally new version of the *Chronicle*, the Peterborough compiler had the unique opportunity to produce a manuscript from scratch, and potentially to modify the proto-E *Chronicle* quite radically to serve the interests of his abbey. This was certainly the case with the compiler of

proposition (directly making a composite text from versions A and √E) less likely, see Baker, ed., *MS F*, p. xlv.

⁶¹ See Brooks, *Early History of the Church of Canterbury*, p. 149 and pp. 161–2. See also Baker, ed., *MS F*, p. lxii.

⁶² See Baker, ed., *MS F*, pp. xxxvi–xxxviii.

⁶³ See annal 870 E: 'On þa ilcan tima þa comon hi to Medeshamstede, beorndon 7 bræcon, slogon abbot 7 munecas 7 eall þet hi þær fundon' (At the same time they came to *Medeshamstede*, burned and destroyed, slew the abbot and monks and all that they found there).

⁶⁴ Kelly, ed., *Charters of Peterborough Abbey*, pp. 20–5.

F, who has left his trace in the manuscripts that he accessed. However, parallel entries in the F text, other *Chronicle* versions deriving from the Northern Recension (for example, D), and Latin texts making use of a similar set of vernacular annals like the WA, reveal that the Peterborough compiler actually makes very little change with respect to his received *Chronicle* text. The analysis of the Interpolations has identified the contextual use of pre-existing annals to articulate abbey history, a particular case in point being 1070 E, recording the raid of Hereward on the abbey, which (barring the Peterborough account) remains remarkably close to the corresponding annal in the D version of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*.⁶⁵ While the Peterborough compiler kept the vernacular form of his exemplar, rather than adopting the bilingual and compressed format preferred by the compiler of F, the E text still retains a surprising element which compromises the vernacular identity of the text. This is a set of Norman annals in Latin, some of which (though not all) are shared by the F text, and were almost certainly inserted in the proto-E text at Canterbury by the compiler of F.⁶⁶ Not all of the Latin annals extant in E are used by the F text, and this may indicate a complex editorial relationship between the proto-E, the F text, and the various versions of the Norman annals accessed at Canterbury.⁶⁷ What is most significant is their retention by the compiler of the Peterborough text, even though they contribute marginally to the overall impact of the E text. They may be associated with a tradition of Norman historiography, but this would have been more suited to the concerns of the Canterbury compiler. These Norman annals could very easily have been omitted by the Peterborough compiler, but were nevertheless retained in the final version of the E text, therefore indicating a specific editorial choice regarding the contents of the proto-E text.

Baker has commented on the F-compiler's access to multiple versions of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, and notes that his intervention is much less in the proto-E text in comparison to the changes made in the A version.⁶⁸ Irvine also corroborates this lesser degree of intervention by the F compiler in the proto-E text, and considers it significant, particularly with respect to the Old English entries. Even though the F-scribe seems to have had a tendency to modify almost every text that he accessed, this lesser interference with the proto-E indicates that 'this version of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* was

⁶⁵ See above, Chapter 1, pp. 44–9.

⁶⁶ See Baker, ed., *MS F*, pp. l–lvi.

⁶⁷ A detailed discussion of the precise nature and contents of the Norman annals in the E forms the subject of a forthcoming study on the transmission history of the *Chronicle* in the twelfth century. For a version of how the Latin annals were incorporated in E, see Irvine, ed., *MS E*, pp. lxxviii–xc.

⁶⁸ See Baker, ed., *MS F*, pp. xxvii–lxxxi.

considered particularly authoritative by the scribe and therefore less open to scribal interference'.⁶⁹ Therefore, even in its Canterbury phase, the proto-E *Chronicle* may have been accorded a status greater than the other (earlier) *Chronicle* versions. The exact reasons for this are unclear, but it could have been the result of a number of factors, like the contemporariness of the proto-E version, or its links to the Northern Recension and its indirect association with Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*.⁷⁰ The unquestioned retention of all features of the proto-E in the construction of the *Chronicle* at Peterborough certainly shows an awareness of the intervention in the proto-E made by the compiler of F (which may indicate an awareness of the F text), but it is also a gesture of deference to the traditional nature of the text at Peterborough. Given the strong possibility that Peterborough obtained the *Chronicle* via Canterbury, it is also very likely that this impression of the text as sacrosanct was transferred over from the previous phase of its compilation. This perception of the text would have contributed significantly to a nuanced integration of Peterborough origin history into the proto-E text, carefully retaining the annals of the Common Stock. It would also account for a scrupulous retention of all textual features from its previous phase (and this includes the Latin entries, albeit irrelevant), even though the Interpolations and the Continuations vastly changed the nature of the text.

The unlocalised annals in the E text make it impossible to claim definitively that the production of a *Chronicle* version at Canterbury inspired the production of the E text at Peterborough. However, it is significant that the Peterborough compiler's attitude to his received *Chronicle* text strongly echoes the text's previous phase of compilation at Canterbury. This editorial and compilatory stance would also explain the retention at Peterborough of the vernacular format traditionally associated with the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, and would further support the possibility that the production of this text would complement contemporary textual activity in Latin. By the time the proto-E was taken to Peterborough, the abbey had probably already produced a house-history (the *Relatio Heddae*), and its first cartulary, the *Liber Niger*, would also have been in the pipeline. Given the scribal links between these endeavours, it has already been suggested that there was ample collaboration between the compilers of these texts.⁷¹ Therefore, a vernacular text, particularly one with a pedigree of

⁶⁹ See Irvine, ed., *MS E*, p. xliii.

⁷⁰ This may also have contributed to the use of the proto-E by historiographers like Henry of Huntingdon, who saw themselves in a direct line of succession to the tradition represented by Bede, see below, pp. 125–8.

⁷¹ See above, pp. 105–10.

historiography like the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, would certainly have added lustre to the Peterborough collection.

All the evidence points towards the fact that the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* was part of a thriving culture of historiography in both vernacular and Latin. At Peterborough, there is evidence of close interaction between Latin and vernacular historiography at the local level, not only with regard to the relationship between the *Relatio*, the *Liber Niger* and the *Chronicle*, but also with respect to the connections between the E text and the later Latin house-history of *Hugh Candidus*. However, to consider the wider implications of such interactions, we need to place the writing of the *Chronicle* in the context of the work of Latin historians who make use of the *Chronicle*. Many of the named Latin historians of this period (for example, John of Worcester, Henry of Huntingdon and William of Malmesbury) were aware of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* as a legitimate and important source text, and there are many correspondences between these Latin histories and the *Chronicle* versions. This is certainly recognition of the established tradition of vernacular historiography that the *Chronicle* represents, but its contemporary use also indicates its continuing value as a source of history. This, in turn, has implications for the status of the *Chronicle* in the twelfth century, and its dissemination and use. This aspect is examined in the following section.

The Chronicle and the world of Latin historiography

The writing of the *Chronicle* at both Peterborough abbey and Christ Church, Canterbury is an important part of their historiographical endeavours in the post-Conquest period. However, outside and beyond these centres, similar *Chronicle* versions were also being made use of by other chroniclers to construct their texts. While the E text remains the last major version of the *Chronicle* in the vernacular,⁷² there is plenty of evidence to show that the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* remained an important source, particularly in the production of Latin historiography. Its use ranged from a straightforward incorporation and translation of annals to more complex compilatory processes of combining material from multiple *Chronicle* versions (particularly in the texts by John of Worcester, Henry of Huntingdon or William of Malmesbury). This section focuses on the connections between the

⁷² The existence of a fragment of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (London, British Library, MS Cotton Domitian A ix, otherwise known as version H), though unrelated to the version used by Peterborough, also seems to indicate the presence of chronicling activity in the vernacular in centres other than Peterborough and Canterbury, but the evidence is too sparse to draw any definite conclusions.

Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and the wider corpus of historiography in Latin. Two salient issues will be discussed here. The first is the circulation of the proto-E version of the *Chronicle* and the way in which it was treated as a source. The second is an exploration of the possibility that both Latin and vernacular historians had access to similar sources and a common body of information. The emphasis throughout will be less on the textual correspondences between Latin and vernacular texts, and more on what their interactions may tell us about the cultural status of vernacular historiography, and the dissemination and use of the *Chronicle*, in the twelfth century.

The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle as a source

The annals bearing the closest correspondence to the Peterborough Chronicle are the Latin WA (London, British Library, MS Cotton Vespasian A xvi). This is an incomplete chronicle containing annals from AD 1 to 1291. The first portion of the manuscript, as far as annal 999, is written in a twelfth-century hand, and a second scribe (belonging to the twelfth century or the beginning of the thirteenth) wrote annals 1000–1201. A third scribe continued the text further, up to 1219, after which various hands are found, indicating contemporary composition and continuation.⁷³ This text was definitely compiled later than the first instalment of the E text at Peterborough around 1121, as the Cistercian abbey of Waverley (Surrey) was not founded before 1128.⁷⁴ From 1000 to 1121, the WA incorporate annals (in translation) from a version of the *Chronicle* remarkably similar to the E text. Luard, in editing the WA, suggested the E text as a direct source, but, given the absence of Peterborough material in the WA, Clark contended that the text could not ‘be derived from E itself but must go back independently to a common source’, and this has been corroborated by Irvine as well.⁷⁵ The WA thus form a significant point of comparison with the E text, and the parallel presence of the *Chronicle* annals in Latin are pointers to the material that was modified at Peterborough, or even earlier.⁷⁶ The WA provide the most compelling evidence for the dissemination and use of the vernacular *Chronicle* in the latter half of the twelfth

⁷³ Luard, ed., *Annales Monastici*, II, pp. xxx–xxxi.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. xxx. The abbey was founded by William Giffard, bishop of Winchester.

⁷⁵ Luard, ed., *Annales Monastici*, II, p. xxxiii; Clark, ed., *The Peterborough Chronicle*, p. xx. Also see Irvine, ed., *MS E*, pp. xxxiv–xxxv.

⁷⁶ See Home, “‘These things we have written about him’: the Portrait of King William in ‘The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle’ 1086E”, pp. 239–68, where the WA forms an important parallel in assessing the way annal 1086 was originally written. The annal as it now stands in the E text may have been modified to incorporate marginalia as part of its main text.

century, indicating that the format of the *Chronicle* could still be used as a viable base text for a set of annals in Latin, well after it had been used at Peterborough to construct a vernacular version.

This use of a vernacular *Chronicle* version at both Peterborough and Waverley raises a number of questions about the status of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* and its links with Latin historiography. The direct and extremely close translation of the vernacular annals seems to indicate the authoritative nature of the source, and the historiographical tradition that it represents. It is also significant that the WA uses a proto-E *Chronicle* without the Peterborough additions, though the text contains elements inserted into the proto-E at Canterbury (for example, some Norman annals now extant in the E text, which were inserted by the compiler of the F text). This indicates that the proto-E *Chronicle* obtained by Waverley was a version after its Canterbury phase, which, in turn, has important ramifications for our perception of the dissemination and use of the *Chronicle* in the twelfth century. For one, it shows that a *Chronicle* version very similar to, or derived from, the proto-E is being used well after its Peterborough phase, thus giving it a great deal of longevity as a source text. Furthermore, the direct use of the vernacular annals as a source for the Latin WA without any major modification is also reminiscent of the status that the proto-E version was accorded at Canterbury, and subsequently by the compiler at Peterborough. The vernacular annals up to 1121 are copied almost word for word in WA, which opens up the possibility that this particular version of the *Chronicle* was accorded a similar status at least at Waverley, thus resisting major modification during its translation. The choice to retain the annal format in the WA may have further contributed to this close relationship. This hints at a complex network of textual relationships between the proto-E, the E text, and the WA, which, however, remains beyond the scope of this study, and must await a more up-to-date edition of the Latin text. Nevertheless, they do raise questions about the accessibility and use of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* in the twelfth century, the extent of its dissemination, and the status that it was accorded by Latin historians.

Latin historians like John of Worcester, Henry of Huntingdon and William of Malmesbury all drew on multiple sources for the construction of their texts, and frequently combined, collated or eliminated material in the process. Their use of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* is therefore complicated by the fact that frequently more than one version was accessed. Nevertheless, the consistent use of the *Chronicle* by all three major Latin historians necessarily raises the question of how the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, as a representative of an earlier tradition of vernacular historiography, may have influenced the form as well as the content of Latin historiography.

Structurally, the *Chronicle of John of Worcester* has similarities with

the format of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. It follows an annal structure strongly dependent on a chronological narrative of significant events drawing on the tradition of the Christian World Chronicle; in John's case, that of Marianus Scotus.⁷⁷ The same format also informed the writing of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, and influenced the inclusion of the key events of Christian history in the Common Stock. However, the *Chronicle of John of Worcester* is more descriptive, drawing upon a range of sources and integrating them to form a text which looks forward to the histories of Henry of Huntingdon and William of Malmesbury, and, in turn, becomes an important source for these texts.⁷⁸ With respect to the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, John of Worcester seems mostly to have made use of a version similar to D as a source for some of the annals till 1087.⁷⁹ While this is not surprising given the Worcester associations of that version,⁸⁰ it is also significant that John does not seem to incorporate the material present in D relating to Margaret of Scotland.⁸¹ Some of the chronological inaccuracies in D, notably relating to annals 1067–1069, are also absent in John's text, which may imply a slightly different exemplar. However, if it was indeed version D of the *Chronicle* which was available as a source to John of Worcester, he did not follow it exactly, and more often than not combined it with other sources.⁸²

One of these sources may actually be the version of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* similar to that used at Peterborough, particularly for the period from around 1080, even though some annals belonging to this period are clearly a deviation from those present in the E text.⁸³ For example, John only makes a passing reference to the Domesday survey in annal 1086, in marked contrast to the indignation expressed in 1085 E. However, he does refer to information shared by E for a range of annals till around 1131.⁸⁴ He also refers to the meetings of the royal court, which indicate familiarity with a version akin to the E text. These royal movements have already been noted as a significant part of the writing of the text at Peterborough, being used as a narrative framing device and a structural link to connect the old and new

⁷⁷ R. R. Darlington and P. McGurk, ed., *The Chronicle of John of Worcester Vol. II: The Annals from 450 to 1066* (Oxford, 1995), pp. xviii–xix.

⁷⁸ Brett, 'John of Worcester and His Contemporaries', pp. 101–26, particularly pp. 105–13. John's accretion of sources is diagrammatically represented on p. 109.

⁷⁹ McGurk, ed., *The Chronicle of John of Worcester, Vol III*, pp. xx–xxvi.

⁸⁰ Introduction, pp. 13–14, and Cubbin, ed., *MS D*, pp. lxx–lxxiv.

⁸¹ McGurk, *The Chronicle of John of Worcester, Vol. III*, p. xxi.

⁸² *Ibid.*, p. xxii.

⁸³ See Irvine, ed., *MS E*, pp. xxxv–xxxvi, and McGurk, *The Chronicle of John of Worcester, Vol. III*, p. xxii.

⁸⁴ McGurk, *The Chronicle of John of Worcester, Vol. III*, p. xxiii. See annals 1087, 1093, 1097, 1104, 1106, 1130 and 1131.

portions of the E text.⁸⁵ However, unlike the E text, John is selective in his use of this material regarding the movements of the court, and also rearranges this information within the annal, perhaps a natural consequence of conflation with information derived from Eadmer and Marianus Scotus.⁸⁶ Therefore, it seems that, for John of Worcester at least, the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* was an important source text, though not an exclusive one, as material was frequently combined with information drawn from other texts, and the contents rearranged. He seems to have drawn on versions akin to D and E, both derived from the Northern Recension of the *Chronicle*, which also seems to imply that a version close to the proto-E version used at Canterbury and Peterborough, and later at Waverley, was certainly in common circulation in the twelfth century.

Like John of Worcester, William of Malmesbury also seems to have used the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* as a source, though, unlike him, he made a conscious decision not to use the form or structure of the *Chronicle*.⁸⁷ William takes Bede as his model, stating that there is none after him who has written a comprehensive history of the English in Latin, thus implying that the *Historia Regum* would fill this void.⁸⁸ The quality of a historiographical work is as important to William of Malmesbury as the language of historiography, and he disapproves of the bad Latin of Æthelweard's adaptation of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*.⁸⁹ Furthermore, Malmesbury's focus was biographical history, and character delineation remains the most memorable aspect of his work.⁹⁰ The tendency towards digression that this genre necessarily

⁸⁵ Chapter 2, pp. 64–5. Brooks suggests that this information may have been produced centrally from the royal court for dissemination, see Nicholas Brooks, 'Why is the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle about Kings?', *ASE* 39 (2010), 43–70, particularly pp. 58–60.

⁸⁶ McGurk, *The Chronicle of John of Worcester*, Vol. III, pp. xxiii–xxvi.

⁸⁷ See R. A. B. Mynors, R. M. Thomson and M. Winterbottom, eds., *William of Malmesbury: Gesta Regum Anglorum Vol. I* (Oxford, 1998), pp. 14–15. William seems to think of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* as a stop-gap measure to record events of history, rather than the interpretative act of Bede's magnum opus: 'Sunt sane quaedam uetustatis inditia cronico more et patrio sermone per annos Domini ordinata. Per haec senium obliuionis eluctari meruerunt quaecumque tempora post illum uirum fluxerunt.' (There are, it is true, some records in the form of annals in the mother-tongue, arranged in order of date; and thanks to these the period since Bede has contrived to escape the dotage of oblivion.)

⁸⁸ *Ibid.* 'Res Anglorum gestas Beda, uir maxime doctus et minime superbus, ab aduentu eorum in Britanniam usque ad suos dies plano et suauis sermone absoluit, post eum no facile, ut arbitror, reperies qui histories illius gentis Latina oratione texendis animum dederit.' (The history of the English, from their arrival in Britain to his own time, has been told with straightforward charm by Bede, most learned and least proud of men. After Bede you will not easily, I think, find anyone who has devoted himself to writing English history in Latin.)

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*

⁹⁰ R. M. Thomson, ed., *William of Malmesbury: Gesta Regum Anglorum*, Vol. II (Oxford, 1999) p. xliii, and n. 74.

involves would be hard to sustain within the annal format adopted by the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* or by John of Worcester.⁹¹

However, William of Malmesbury does consider the *Chronicle* to be an important source for the early history of English kings. For much of the contents of Book I of the *Historia Regum*, he seems to have made use of Bede and the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, along with other sources like Gildas, a version of John of Worcester's *Chronicle* and associated sources, genealogies, regnal lists, hagiography and charter material.⁹² Malmesbury seems to have drawn on a version of the *Chronicle* most resembling the E text, which further strengthens the claim that the proto-E version was the most popular *Chronicle* version accessed in the post-Conquest period. There seems to be no evidence that the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* was used by William of Malmesbury after 1087,⁹³ and much of his information for the post-Conquest period was derived from other sources. In the case of William of Malmesbury, as in the case of John of Worcester, it is difficult to posit definitively the exact version (or versions) of the *Chronicle* used, whether they accessed a single version, multiple versions or a conflated edition. However, it can be said with some surety that both historians certainly used a *Chronicle* version very similar to that accessed by the compilers at Canterbury and Peterborough, thus indicating that this text (and its variants) had the most currency as a source amongst extant *Chronicle* versions. William of Malmesbury certainly drew on the libraries of Christ Church and St Augustine's, Canterbury, and may well have obtained a copy of the proto-E version from there.⁹⁴

John of Worcester's use of the chronological model of Christian world history that also lay at the heart of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, and his retention of the annal format, brings him formally closer to the earlier vernacular tradition. By contrast, the relatively limited use of the *Chronicle* by William of Malmesbury (in comparison to John of Worcester) may be due to his conscious departure from the annalistic form. Henry of Huntingdon moves further away – from a formal and structural point of view – from the annal structure dominated

⁹¹ The Rev. J. Sharpe, whose assessment of William of Malmesbury has been reprinted by Thomson in volume II of the *Gesta Regum*, comments: 'Of his apt delineation of character, and happy mode of seizing the most prominent features of his personages, it is difficult to speak in terms of adequate commendation. He does not weary with a tedious detail, "line upon line", nor does he complete his portrait at a sitting. On the contrary, the traits are scattered, the proportions disunited, the body dismembered, as it were; but in a moment some master-stroke is applied, some vivid flash of Promethean fire animates the canvas, and the perfect figure darts into life and expression: hence we have the surly ferocious snarl of the Conqueror, and the brutal horse-laugh of Rufus.' *Ibid.*, p. xliii.

⁹² *Ibid.*, p. 12.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 12–14.

⁹⁴ King and Potter, ed., *Historia Novella*, p. xxv, and R. M. Thomson, *William of Malmesbury* (Woodbridge, 1987), pp. 45–7, 70, 73–5.

by chronology favoured by the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* and John of Worcester, and creates a text that is a complex amalgam of a range of sources. Like William of Malmesbury, Henry belongs to the tradition of 'weaver-compilers', where the act of authorship is intrinsically linked to the functions of compilation, collation and reordering of a range of sources to create a new text out of the old.⁹⁵ Like William, he is also conscious of his function as a historian, but, unlike the former's use of Bede as a model, Henry sees himself as the successor of a tradition of historiography represented by both Bede and the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. In his Preface to the *Historia Anglorum*, Henry notes the instructions of his patron Bishop Alexander, who instructed him to use Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica* as much as possible, and also make use of 'chronicles preserved in ancient libraries', obviously referring to a body of pre-Conquest historiography best represented by the versions of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*.⁹⁶ Henry frequently refers to the tradition represented by the *Chronicle* as the 'books of the ancients', and this is an important part of the tradition of historiography that he claims to represent.⁹⁷ In constantly inscribing and referring to an earlier tradition of historiography within the framework of his text, Henry seems to imply that, though constructing his text in Latin, he does not see his enterprise as a departure from tradition, but rather as building upon its foundations.

Henry seems to have made use of the exemplar of the E text, not unusual given his links with the Fenland abbeys, including Peterborough, whose abbots he claims to have known personally.⁹⁸ In Henry's case, there was certainly the practical element of obtaining the exemplar of a *Chronicle* that was already being used in the area. However, the proto-E was also derived from the Northern Recension, making its relationship to Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica* clear through its prefatorial material, and it is possible that this aspect would have made this particular *Chronicle* version particularly appropriate for

⁹⁵ See Greenway, *Historia Anglorum*, p. lxxxv, n. 81.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. lxxxv, gives a rough percentage of Henry's sources: 25% from Bede, 40% from the ASC and 10% from other written sources. Also see the Preface by Henry of Huntingdon, pp. 4-7.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, li. 26, 'libris ueterum' pp. 108-9; iv. 14, 'scriptis ueterum' pp. 234-5; iv. 17, 'scripta ueterum' pp. 240-1; v. 16, 'scriptura ueterum' pp. 304-5; vi. 12, 'historiis ueterum' pp. 356-7; vii. 1, 'libris ueterum' pp. 412-13.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. xlv. Henry knew all the abbots from 1098 to after 1132, which makes him a possible witness to the chronicling activity at the abbey. Also see *De Contemptu Mundi*, c17, text and translation in Greenway, *Historia Anglorum*, pp. 614-15: 'Et hii ubi sunt? Turaldas abbas Burgensis et Ernulfus et Mathias et Godricus et Iohannes et Martinus, quos omnes uidimus, exinaniti sunt, et ad nichilum deuenerunt.' (Where are they? Turolde, abbot of Peterborough, and Ernulf, and Matthew, and Godric, and John, and Martin, all of whom I have seen, are dead, and come to nothing.) Henry also witnessed a grant at Peterborough in 1141, see *ibid.*, p. clxix.

the existing focus of Henry's project.⁹⁹ Though there is no doubt that Henry 'used and translated a version which was very closely allied to that at Peterborough', this is not the only *Chronicle* version that he referred to. Henry also seems to have referred to annals and genealogies now extant in versions A–C, particularly for some sixth- and seventh-century annals, and to material found in versions A–D, for some eighth- to tenth-century annals.¹⁰⁰ Though this material is not found in version E as it stands, Henry frequently collates information from earlier *Chronicle* versions with details found in E, much like the compiler of the F text at Canterbury. For the post-Conquest period, however, most of the information derived from the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* is almost exclusively from a version akin to the E text.

There is ample evidence to suggest that the tradition of vernacular historiography as represented by the various versions of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* is drawn upon extensively by the known Latin historians of the twelfth century. Their use of more than one *Chronicle* version indicates that they were well aware of the multiplicity of the earlier vernacular historical tradition, but the collation of material from various versions also indicates an awareness of the individual features of each text. The proto-E version (or a related version) was certainly accessed at some stage by John of Worcester, William of Malmesbury and Henry of Huntingdon. It is also the version that is invariably drawn upon with regard to information relating to the post-Conquest period, and it is possible that it was a combination of contemporary chronicling and its association with Bede's *Historia* (through its prefatorial material) that imbued this particular version with the authority to be the definitive source for post-Conquest events. The close translation of this version at Waverley, the lesser degree of intervention in this version by the F compiler, and the retention of all its prior features by the Peterborough compiler, all suggests that the proto-E *Chronicle* was certainly accorded a particular status in relation to the other *Chronicle* versions. Evidence suggests that both known and anonymous Latin historians were aware of the multiplicity of the *Chronicle* tradition, yet the exclusive use of the proto-E version (or related versions) as a source for post-Conquest events by John of Worcester, William of Malmesbury and Henry of Huntingdon indicates

⁹⁹ This may also be the reason why a D-E version seems to have been accessed by both William of Malmesbury and John of Worcester. While there is no direct evidence to suggest that this could have been an additional reason for the relative authority accorded to the proto-E version by the compiler of F at Canterbury, in the light of the use of this version at Canterbury, Peterborough and Waverley, and by the Latin historians, it remains a distinct possibility.

¹⁰⁰ Henry derives information from annals 547, 560, 597, 611, 626, 641, 688 in the A–C versions, and from 745, 841, 893–6, 900, 902–3, 906, 909, 912–14, 942–3 and 945 in versions A–D, see Greenway, *Historia Anglorum*, p. xcii.

the popularity and importance of this version (and by implication the tradition represented by this form of vernacular historiography) in the twelfth century.

The use of multiple *Chronicle* versions in parallel by these Latin historians, and the many layers of correspondence between the vernacular texts and the Latin historiography, also suggest that there is not necessarily a clean line of transmission between the source texts and the narrative that draws on them. This opens up the possibility of a more complex relationship between Latin and vernacular historiography, which needs to be explored.

Shared narratives

While all the Latin historians discussed so far make use of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* as a source, their access to multiple versions also makes textual relationships more complex. In the case of John of Worcester and William of Malmesbury, the internal relationships between their texts further complicate the matter. John used the *Gesta Regum* for the revision of his work, and it is very likely that William of Malmesbury was aware of John's text. While it cannot be proved that Malmesbury accessed a final version of John's *Chronicle*, the most likely scenario is that both William of Malmesbury and John of Worcester had access to a similar body of sources, and frequently exchanged information in the process of constructing their respective texts.¹⁰¹ This complicates the relationships between the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, the *Chronicle of John of Worcester* and the *Historia Regum* of William of Malmesbury, as the process involves multiple layers of compilation, and a greater degree of transmutation in the Latin texts. However, it also suggests that the interactions between vernacular and Latin historiography may have been more sustained and frequent than hitherto perceived. Drawing on a survey of the shared information between the *Peterborough Chronicle* and John's text after 1121, and particularly the absence of specific Peterborough pointers in some of the annals of the First Continuation, Irvine has suggested the possibility of a common network of texts being accessed by both vernacular and Latin historians, rather than a simple case of borrowing. Irvine discusses the non-Peterborough material contained in the First Continuation, and makes a case based on the remarkable similarities

¹⁰¹ As Brett comments (p. 117), 'From the outset ... John's chronicle was constructed out of materials which were the objects of active traffic between Canterbury, Malmesbury and Worcester. Its subsequent revision shows these exchanges widening and intensifying.' See Brett, 'John of Worcester and His Contemporaries', particularly pp. 113–17, and Darlington and McGurk, *The Chronicle of John of Worcester*, Vol. II, pp. lxxvii–lxxvi.

in content between the Peterborough text and the *Chronicle of John of Worcester*, one maintained consistently over a number of entries.¹⁰²

It is possible to speculate that the use of shared sources by both Latin and vernacular historiography may have extended beyond John of Worcester's use of the material also accessed by the Peterborough compiler. Henry of Huntingdon demonstrates a sustained use of a version akin to the proto-E for his narrative of post-Conquest events, certainly till 1121. However, Greenway goes further, arguing that Henry of Huntingdon actually uses the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* to 1133, which suggests that he had access to a version (or versions) going beyond 1121, the cut-off date posited for the proto-E version before it reaches Peterborough. Indeed, if we compare the annals of the First Continuation with Henry's narrative, there are similarities in content, though there is no evidence to suggest that this material came via Peterborough. Information regarding the meetings of the royal court, the death of Robert Bloet, bishop of Lincoln, the accession of William of Corbeil as archbishop of Canterbury, and Alexander as bishop of Lincoln, are common between the two texts, as are the narratives noting the arrival of John of Crema, the castration of the moneyers for dealing in false coin, the false crusade of Hugh de Payns, and the prohibitive price of corn. Nevertheless, there are also important differences between the E text and Henry's narrative. There are details in Henry's text not found in E (for example, the salacious story of John of Crema being discovered with a whore after preaching against married priests), just as there are details in the E text not found in Henry of Huntingdon's narrative (for example, the dying words of Robert Bloet, who does not speak in Henry's narrative). It is possible that Henry of Huntingdon did indeed have access to an incomplete exemplar of the E text, perhaps from Peterborough, which he then modified to suit his own purposes, but it seems much more likely that both the compiler of the First Continuation at Peterborough and Henry of Huntingdon had access to a common body of information or set of annals. While the correspondences between Henry of Huntingdon and the *Peterborough Chronicle* in the period 1121 to 1133 certainly suggest such a possibility, it is actually the differences between the two texts that make this scenario most likely. The *Peterborough Chronicle* displays a distinct antagonism towards the role of Roger of Salisbury in both political and ecclesiastical scenarios. He is held culpable for the castration of the moneyers, is said to possess almost unlimited power as an agent of the king, and most importantly, conspired with Robert

¹⁰² See Irvine, 'The Production of the Peterborough Chronicle', particularly pp. 60–6. Also see Brooks, 'Why is the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle about Kings?', pp. 43–70, for the possibility that the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* to 1131 may itself have drawn upon a set of annals written in English emanating from the royal court.

Bloet to ensure that monks would be subservient to superiors from secular rather than monastic orders.¹⁰³ It is an attitude that would have been impossible for Henry of Huntingdon to be sympathetic to, raised as he was in the household of Robert Bloet, and writing his *Historia Anglorum* under the patronage of Alexander of Lincoln. Therefore, it is highly unlikely that, for information shared by him and the E text after 1121, Henry had access to a text from Peterborough itself. This, then, raises the possibility of a range of common sources accessed by both vernacular and Latin historians, to be modified according to the demands of their texts, arguing for a flexible and symbiotic relationship between vernacular and Latin historiography in the twelfth century.

Given the correspondences between the Peterborough text and the Latin historians, it seems that the general trend in using the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* was partly dictated by the availability of *Chronicle* versions, and partly by the information contained in the texts. While most versions of the *Chronicle* are referred to mostly for their pre-Conquest material, it is the proto-E (or related version) that is invariably accessed for information relating to the post-Conquest period. For the period after 1121, which is where the proto-E text obtained by Peterborough seems to have ended, the relationship between the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* and the Latin historians becomes more complex. While there is some shared information (for example, the notices of the royal court and other events of importance), there are also differences in content, particularly with respect to narrative bias and tone. The absence of parallel *Chronicle* versions for this period always leaves open the possibility that a lost version of the *Chronicle* was available to these Latin historians. However, it is far more likely that the Peterborough compiler, as well as contemporary Latin historians, had access to a common body of information, which may have in the vernacular, or a combination of Latin and vernacular, and was then reworked according to the needs of these chroniclers.

The possibility of a network of information shared by both Latin and vernacular historians is also supported by similarities between the account of the Anarchy in 1137 E and contemporary parallel Latin texts. The authorial intention of the Second Continuator has already been discussed earlier,¹⁰⁴ but it is significant to note that while the Peterborough narrative is similar to a range of narratives describing the Anarchy, it is exactly parallel to none of them. King initially suggested that the Peterborough compiler drew upon William of Malmesbury's *Historia Novella*, as the ideas in the account by William 'were developed, in the same order, in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle,

¹⁰³ See 1123 and 1125 E.

¹⁰⁴ See Chapter 2, pp. 81–99.

strongly suggesting that this text from Malmesbury was available at Peterborough in King Stephen's lifetime',¹⁰⁵ though he changed his mind on this issue.¹⁰⁶ However, King does suggest a possible link in personnel between the two texts, linking a member of the de Waterville family (one of whom later became abbot of Peterborough) with Robert, earl of Gloucester (to whom William of Malmesbury's *Historia Novella* is dedicated).¹⁰⁷ Textually, the link with 1137 E is complicated by the fact that the section of the *Historia Novella* which bears most resemblance to the Peterborough text appears in an interpolation in the second edition,¹⁰⁸ thus indicating that there is no definitive evidence of direct borrowing.¹⁰⁹ It seems most likely that, in this instance as well, both vernacular and Latin historians drew on a common body of information accessible to both: a generic roll call of tortures conveying an artistic impression of the horrors of the time, which was then possibly used with relevant local variations.¹¹⁰ For the Peterborough compiler, this general overview offsets the more specific focus on the activities of Abbot Martin. The need to explain the terminology of torture ('crucethus', for example) makes it distinctly possible that the source material was in Latin, though the very lack of exact parallels serves to demonstrate the generic nature of such accounts of the Anarchy, and the way it was creatively modified to serve various ideological and local interests.

There is no doubt that Latin historiography was on the rise, and it is a matter of evidence that examples of Latin historiography in the post-Conquest period are more prolific. However, there is also no evidence to suggest that the proliferation of Latin historiography was because of a dearth of vernacular texts. The writing of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* at Canterbury and Peterborough, the wide dissemination of the proto-E *Chronicle* during and after its Peterborough phase, and the extensive use of this version by contemporary Latin historians, all

¹⁰⁵ See 'Introduction' in King, ed., *The Anarchy of King Stephen's Reign*, p. 2.

¹⁰⁶ See King and Potter, eds, *Historia Novella*, p. xcvi, n. 404.

¹⁰⁷ 'The ASC concludes with the election of William de Waterville as abbot of Peterborough ... The Waterville family were hereditary stewards of the abbey of Peterborough; a younger brother of the contemporary tenant of the abbey fee was Geoffrey de Waterville; and Geoffrey de Waterville was the steward of Robert earl of Gloucester'. See *ibid.*, pp. xcv–xcvi.

¹⁰⁸ The copy extant as London, British Library, Royal MS 13.D.ii, fols 110r–123v, described *ibid.*, pp. lxxiv–lxxv. Also see *ibid.*, pp. 70–5.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, p. xcvi. 'There is not enough to support the view that the [*Historia Novella*] was used by the writer of the ASC. It is more likely that what we are dealing with here, and in descriptions of the Anarchy from other authors, are independently produced variations on a number of common themes.' Also see Clark, ed., *The Peterborough Chronicle*, pp. 106–9.

¹¹⁰ For example, the emphasis on the modes and instruments of torture is much more apparent in the Peterborough text than in the *Historia Novella*, compare 1137 (Irvine, *MS E*, pp. 134–6) with King and Potter, eds, *Historia Novella*, pp. 70–5.

seem to indicate that vernacular historiography, and particularly the tradition represented by the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, was an integral part of post-Conquest text production. The formal awareness of all these texts, both Latin and vernacular, also needs to be emphasised here. All the Latin historians discussed so far (both named historians and the anonymous compilers of the WA) make conscious choices regarding the form and function of their texts. The annal format may be eschewed or retained, and decisions about the temporal and geographical compass of the text influence the choice of source material. This awareness is also present in the construction of the *Chronicle* at both Canterbury and Peterborough. Despite the radical rewriting of history by the compiler of F, his scrupulous collation of information from other sources indicates an awareness of the broader framework of national history narrated by the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. This is even more applicable for the compilers of the Peterborough text, who retain their focus on national events throughout the text in all its phases, even though we are left in no doubt about their interest in the fortunes of Peterborough abbey. From the nuanced integration of Peterborough charters in the Common Stock to the narrative of the Anarchy followed by the ascension of Henry II, there is a consistent awareness of the form and function of the narrative. These complex connections between Latin and vernacular historiography thus question assumptions of a simplistic decline of history in the vernacular (i.e. the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*) automatically giving rise to the more prolific form of Latin historiography.

Besides the possible use of common source material, there is a further connection between vernacular and Latin historiography which needs to be explored. Both twelfth-century versions of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* at Canterbury and Peterborough draw upon a range of diplomatic and semi-diplomatic sources like grants and charters, and make use of the conventions of extended narrative. In this, they are both very similar to the later Latin house-histories and cartularies that proliferated at various monastic centres in the latter half of the twelfth century and beyond. While this may be a response to the ideological needs of the community, the obvious hybridity also draws attention to the use of generic types in twelfth-century historiography.

Studies of genre, and genre theory, have traditionally focussed on literary texts rather than historiography, and generic categories have usually been linked with the aesthetic aspects of a text.¹¹¹ Therefore,

¹¹¹ This is applicable not just to the Aristotelian theory of poetics, but also Longinus' *On Sublimity*; see Stephen Halliwell, 'Aristotle's Poetics', in *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism* 1. *Classical Criticism*, ed. George A. Kennedy (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 149–83,

the content of a text has always been a central concern for considerations of the purity of generic types, as advocated strongly by classical theorists like Cicero, Quintillian or Horace.¹¹² There is evidence that the study of classical authors formed an important part of the medieval curriculum, despite their apparent conflict with the principles of Christian exegesis.¹¹³ Classical theories of genre and literary criticism were studied and discussed in the twelfth century and later, and formed a significant part of the commentaries and analyses of a text.¹¹⁴ However, irrespective of theory, writers were always free to experiment, and medieval historiography seems to show a particular propensity for mixing types, incorporating elements from charters and diplomas, as well as dramatic narrative and poetry.¹¹⁵ Isidore of Seville considered *historia* (as opposed to *fabula*) to be the narrative of true events, and part of the category of Grammar.¹¹⁶ However, the act of writing history involved as much selection and elimination of material as the construction of a literary text, and the co-existence of a range of generic types (narrative, annal, charter, diploma) in historiography necessarily raises questions about the flexibility of the form.¹¹⁷

Historiography is also, more often than not, judged by its purpose, rather than the extent to which it makes use of, or breaks, generic rules. Sometimes such a purpose may be clearly stated, as for example

and Donald A. Russell, 'Greek Criticism of the Empire', *ibid.*, pp. 297–329, particularly pp. 306–10. For a general overview of generic categories and concepts, see Alastair Fowler, *Kinds of Literature* (Cambridge MA, 1982), particularly 'Concepts of Genre' (pp. 37–53), 'Historical Kinds and the Generic Repertoire' (pp. 54–74), and 'Transformations of Genre' (pp. 170–90).

¹¹² Roman theories of genres seem to have been influenced by their inherited literary models, as well as formal education in grammar and rhetoric. See Elaine Fantham, 'The Growth of Literature and Criticism in Rome', in *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism 1. Classical Criticism*, ed. Kennedy, pp. 220–44, particularly pp. 220 and 227–41. See also Doreen C. Innes, 'Augustan Critics', in *ibid.*, pp. 245–73, particularly pp. 254–66, and Elaine Fantham, 'Latin Criticism of the Early Empire' in *ibid.*, pp. 274–96, at pp. 286–90.

¹¹³ Tertullian famously asked, 'What has Athens got to do with Jerusalem?'. However, most proponents of such a Christian culture were also thoroughly grounded in the Classical literary tradition; see Winthrop Wetherbee, 'From Late Antiquity to the Twelfth Century', *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism 2. The Middle Ages*, ed. Alastair Minnis and Ian Johnson (Cambridge, 2005), pp. 99–144.

¹¹⁴ Vincent Gillespie, 'From the Twelfth Century to c. 1450', in *ibid.*, pp. 145–235.

¹¹⁵ This generic hybridity is applicable not just for the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, but also for historians like Henry of Huntingdon, who seems to have used a range of mixed genres in the *Historia Anglorum*, incorporating dramatic speeches and poetry into a varied narrative style.

¹¹⁶ See Stephen A. Barney *et al.*, *The Etymologies of Isidore of Seville* (Cambridge, 2006), Book I. xli–xliv, p. 67. Also see Martine Irvine and David Thomson, 'Grammatica and Literary Theory', *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism 2. The Middle Ages*, ed. Alastair Minnis and Ian Johnson (Cambridge, 2005), pp. 15–41.

¹¹⁷ For a consideration of the factual and the fictional in historiography, see Partner, *Serious Entertainments*, pp. 194–211.

by William of Malmesbury and Henry of Huntingdon,¹¹⁸ but, more often than not, it may be implied. Particularly in the case of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, which evolved over time from an articulation of West-Saxon dynastic concerns to a more generalised tradition maintained at various centres, it is often difficult to find a coherent and unified articulation regarding its purpose as historiography. Yet, as noted earlier, a sustained awareness of form and function does inform the writing of the *Chronicle*, and the broad framework of national history is maintained even in its twelfth-century incarnations at Canterbury and Peterborough. Nevertheless, from the perspective of how the *Chronicle* develops, the very bilinguality of the F text, or the use of charter material by both Canterbury and Peterborough versions, indicate a departure from previous tradition. At the very least, it raises the issue of the survival of the *Chronicle* as a viable historiographical form in the twelfth century. The following section discusses the generic boundaries of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, and what this means for our perception of the genre of historiography in the twelfth century.

¹¹⁸ William of Malmesbury makes a clear reference to his role as Bede's successor: 'Res Anglorum gestas Beda, uir maxime doctus et minime superbus, ad aduentu eorum in Britanniam usque ad suos dies plano et suauis sermone absoluit; post eum non facile, ut arbitror, reperies qui historiis illius gentis Latina oratione texendis animum dederit ... Vnde michi cum propter patriae caritatem, tum propter adhortantium auctoritatem uoluntati fuit interruptam temporum seriem sarcire et exarata barbarice Romano sale condire[.]' (The history of the English, from their arrival in Britain to his own time, has been told with straightforward charm by Bede, most learned and least proud of men. After Bede you will not easily, I think, find anyone who has devoted himself to writing English history in Latin ... It was therefore my design, in part moved by love of my country, and in part encouraged by influential friends, to mend the broken chain of our history, and give a Roman polish to the rough annals of our native speech); see Mynors and Winterbottom, ed., *William of Malmesbury: Gesta Regum Anglorum Vol. I*, pp. 14–15. Henry of Huntingdon too sees himself as part of a similar historiographical tradition: 'Vbi autem floridus enitescit uirorum fortium magnificentia, prudentium sapientia, iustorum iudicia, temperatum modestia, quam in rerum contextu gestarum? ... Historia igitur preterita quasi presentia uisui representat, futura ex preteritis imaginando diiudicat ... Hec ergo considerans, huius regni gesta et nostre gentis origins, iussu tuo presul Alexander, qui flos et cacumen regni et gentis esse uideris, decurrenda suscepi. Tuo quidem consilio Bede uenerabilis ecclesiasticam qua potui secutus historiam, nonnulla etiam ex aliis excerpens auctoribus, inde cronica in antiquis reseruata librariis compilans, usque nostrum ad auditum et uisum preterita representauit.' (Where does the grandeur of valiant men shine more brightly, or the wisdom of the prudent, or the discretion of the righteous, or the moderation of the temperate, than in the content of history? ... History therefore brings the past into view as though it were present, and allows judgement of the future by representing the past ... With these considerations in mind, therefore, and at your command, Bishop Alexander, I have undertaken to narrate the history of this kingdom and the origins of our people, of which you are regarded as the highest and most splendid ornament. On your advice I have followed the Venerable Bede's Ecclesiastical History where I could, selecting material also from other authors and borrowing from chronicles preserved in ancient libraries, and I have described past events down to the time of our own knowledge and observation); see Greenway, *Historia Anglorum*, pp. 3–7.

*The boundaries of the Chronicle: genre
and historiography*

The emphasis on location, and the clearly defined bounds of the charters inserted in the Interpolations of the *Peterborough Chronicle*, imply not just a place of production and a symbolic *locus*, but also a clearly defined geographical area that can be physically mapped through their markers of identification. A comparison of the charter narrative in the *Chronicle* with the documents from which they are derived shows a high degree of accuracy in the reproduction of the most important elements of a charter (genuine or spurious), namely, the bounds and the witness lists. Paradoxically, while space seems to be conscribed within the bounds of the charter formula, it is this very accuracy in reproducing charter elements that implies a blurring of generic boundaries in the *Chronicle* text itself. For one, this kind of information is not usually associated with the tradition represented by the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, and is only present in the twelfth-century versions at Canterbury and Peterborough. However, it is a consistent feature of Latin house-histories and chronicle cartularies, where charter and diploma are inserted within a narrative framework lending meaning and relevance to charters, genuine and spurious.¹¹⁹ The inclusion of such elements in a *Chronicle* text creates a complex generic situation. On the one hand, there remains a strong emphasis on the annal structure in both the E and F versions, and the E text is particularly scrupulous in retaining as much of the exemplar as possible. Annal features, such as formulaic temporal markers (for example, 'Her', 'Her on þissum geare', 'On þissum geare', or 'Dis geare') are consistently retained, along with the relevant annal numbers. This, along with the selective incorporation of charters, certainly indicates that the *Chronicle* is not conceived of as a cartulary. However, in the case of the *Chronicle* at Peterborough, there also seems to be a strange internal conflict in the incorporation of the charters. While, on the one hand, the Peterborough compiler remains conscious of the limits of the annal format and incorporates dramatic elements to introduce the component parts of the charter, the text also goes so far as to reproduce the cross marks of the signatories which were part of the original charter, thus creating temporarily, within the bounds of the narrative conventions of historiography, the conditions of a chronicle-cartulary, where the diploma or charter is contextualised through narrative.¹²⁰ The F version at Canterbury also

¹¹⁹ See Chapter 1, pp. 23–9.

¹²⁰ See for example, the charter of Wulfhere in the E text; Irvine, ed., *MS E*, pp. 27–9, Whitelock, *Peterborough Chronicle*, p. 31 and Chapter 1, pp. 29–36.

incorporates and refers to charter material, though the F compiler has the tendency to refer back to the 'originals' and modify his text, as well as append the Old English translations as inserted sheets.¹²¹ Indeed, what we see in action in the case of both twelfth-century versions of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* is a process of mutation. The vernacular tradition of historiography develops into a truly hybrid form, somewhere between the conventions of narrative history and the more formalised (and a further hybrid) form of the house-history or chronicle-cartulary.

This incorporation of hybrid elements in the *Chronicle* is unsurprising given the strong links of the E and F versions with the production of cartularies at their respective centres. The F version shares close links with the Canterbury cartularies, and the E text is produced alongside the *Relatio Heddae* and the *Liber Niger*. There is significant overlap between the contents of the *Relatio* and the E text, and the latter claims to bear narrative witness to the 'discovery' of the former. Furthermore, in retrospect, the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* always did have a potential for generic fluidity. Though the annal structure seems to be defined by a strong element of chronological progression, its focus on this single requirement allowed for a degree of flexibility even in earlier renditions of the *Chronicle*. The earlier stages of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* have sections which are more elaborate from the narrative point of view (particularly when events of more than one year are narrated under a single annal format). The same may also be said of other texts following the annal structure; John of Worcester's *Chronicle* for example, follows the chronological format of the Christian World Chronicle, but is neither spare, nor sparse, with its narrative. The minimal requirements of the annal format therefore seem to have facilitated the incorporation of extended narrative, poetry and biography in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. The extent of material may have depended on the transmission of the text as well as editorial choices – the E text, for example, has less poetry in comparison to the A version, but it also contains the extended biography of the Conqueror incorporating a poem not found in any other version of the *Chronicle*.¹²² Therefore, it was only a matter of time before charter material was inserted and referenced in the twelfth century.

It is all too easy to see this generic overlap as a sign of the loss of identity of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, where it loses its status as a vehicle of national historiography to become representative of

¹²¹ See Baker, ed., *MS F*, pp. lvii–lviii. The translation attached to the grant of privileges by Æthelbald of Mercia in annal 742 has been lost.

¹²² This poem may have started life as marginal annotation, but was later incorporated into the main body of the narrative, see Home, "These things we have written about him": the Portrait of King William in "The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle" 1086E, pp. 239–68.

local interests, incorporating alternative generic formats which reinforce its local identity, thus bringing it closer in form to the Latin house-histories which followed. There is no denying that, based on the evidence of extant texts, the *Chronicle* versions at Canterbury and Peterborough are essentially the last versions of the vernacular tradition of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. The writing of the *Chronicle* in the twelfth century cannot compete with the sheer volume of Latin historiography in the post-Conquest period, either in the form of local house-histories, chronicle-cartularies, or texts by named historians like John of Worcester, William of Malmesbury or Henry of Huntingdon. Given the bilingual format of the F version, and the use of Latin charters and other documentation at both Canterbury and Peterborough, the first question that needs to be asked is whether the generic hybridity of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* was a direct consequence of the prodigious contemporary output of documentation in Latin.

There is no evidence to suggest that the generic modification of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, particularly the extensive use of charter material, was because its *form* was deemed insufficient or inferior to the chronicle-cartularies or house-histories in Latin. Indeed, evidence points towards the opposite. The *Chronicle* was continued at both Canterbury and Peterborough despite a significant overlap with diplomatic material of local provenance. Both versions of the *Chronicle* mesh local history into a narrative of national history, and declare their affiliation to an established and revered tradition.¹²³ There is a persistent sense of appropriate content: national events are retained as the broad framework for local events in both text, and the focus on kings and their activities is a feature not just of the earlier part of the *Peterborough Chronicle*, but also its later continuations (for example, the movements of the royal court used as a structural feature by the First Continuator, or the references to Henry I, Stephen and Henry II in both continuations). The formal features of the *Chronicle* (such as the annal format) are scrupulously retained, particularly in the *Peterborough Chronicle*, where it is consciously maintained till the very end.

The E version, which is the last, most complete, extant version of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, is also contemporary to the writing of the abbey's first cartulary, the *Liber Niger*. It even draws on, and validates a Latin house-history (possibly) predating it, making reference to ancient documents recovered from the ruins of *Medeshamstede*. It is continued after the Anarchy with an overview of the tribulations and triumphs of the abbey, and is then made use of by Hugh Candidus,

¹²³ This is not just by their use of the 'Common Stock' portion of the *Chronicle*, but also through the prefatory material derived from Bede present in the Northern Recension. The version accessed by the compiler of both E and F also seems to have been more authoritative in comparison to other versions.

who writes a Latin house-history in the late twelfth century.¹²⁴ This parallel co-existence of texts and information in a variety of formats indicates that the generic hybridity of the *Chronicle* was not a necessity. The inclusion of charter material defined the local provenance of the text, but it was not a failure of the form of the *Chronicle* which made such an action necessary. This, in turn, implies that, despite the incorporation of hybrid elements, the *Chronicle* was considered as a viable form of historiography in its own right, and its vernacular presence co-existed with other texts in Latin. This co-existence on the local level is mirrored by the symbiotic relationship between Latin and vernacular historiography. I noted earlier the connections between the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* and historiography by contemporary Latin historians like John of Worcester, Henry of Huntingdon and William of Malmesbury. Not only was the proto-E version of the *Chronicle* a common source text for the Latin historians, particularly for the post-Conquest period, but there is a distinct possibility that they drew on similar sources of information for a range of events.¹²⁵ While the basic framework of the shared information is similar, they are influenced by individual narrative biases and ideological interests, as well as an awareness of the formal requirements of the text, indicating that the connections between the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* and Latin historiography in the twelfth century involve much more than a simple case of borrowing from a source. Therefore, there is no evidence to suggest that generic hybridity in the *Chronicle* indicates a loss of status in the hierarchy of historiographical forms and genres.¹²⁶

Recent research has demonstrated the sheer volume and longevity of the vernacular manuscript tradition.¹²⁷ A range of manuscripts containing the Old English vernacular was produced in the post-Conquest period, which co-existed in harmony with Latin and Anglo-Norman French, thus indicating a complex (and more realistic) picture of linguistic and cultural continuity and change. The high volume of manuscripts containing English produced in the eleventh and twelfth centuries indicates a strong focus on retaining vernacular identity.¹²⁸ This further supports the assumption that the *Anglo-Saxon*

¹²⁴ For this text and its relationship with historiography at Peterborough, see Chapter 4, pp. 149–68.

¹²⁵ The parallel narratives of specific events as well as the Anarchy seem to indicate a shared network of information drawn on by both Latin and vernacular historians, see above, pp. 129–31.

¹²⁶ Traditional views of the status of generic types would have considered otherwise; see Fowler, *Kinds of Literature*, 'Hierarchies of Genres and Canons of Literature', pp. 213–34, for a general background of the hierarchy of genres.

¹²⁷ *The Production and Use of English Manuscripts 1060 to 1220*, ed. Da Rold *et al.*

¹²⁸ *Ibid.* The manuscripts are listed in the catalogue on the project website <http://www.le.ac.uk/english/em1060to1220/catalogue/intro.htm>.

Chronicle would have been regarded as a strong representative of the tradition of vernacular historiography.

The collation of generic types in the *Chronicle* is therefore not a failure of its form, but perhaps an organic development caused by what was an accepted medieval editorial stance, namely the importance accorded to the act of compilation. The importance of the compiler in the production of medieval texts may be inferred from the care accorded to their construction and compilation, the overt manuscript evidence of compilation (such as marginalia or glosses) and its importance in the reception of a text, which becomes more and more apparent in late medieval manuscripts.¹²⁹ Studies of texts and manuscripts in the transitional phase between a non-print culture and the onset of printing also seem to indicate that, in comparison to the printed text, the manuscript version attracted marginal commentary more readily. It was perceived as less stable (though no less important) than the printed text, and its contents could mutate because it had the potential to become 'the *loci* of ongoing discussion'.¹³⁰ The importance of authoritative sources (*auctoritates*) went hand in hand with the text's ability to be shaped through transmission, and this evolution of the text as it passed from scribe to scribe, or compiler to compiler, is intrinsic to our perception of medieval texts. This process has been described using the terms 'mouvance' (Zumthor)¹³¹ or 'variance' (Cerquiglioni),¹³² though these have more currency in literary criticism than in historical studies. This critical perspective suggests that fluidity and mobility are essential features of medieval texts, which could be indefinitely reworked by various scribes and compilers. It questions modern assumptions about the 'authenticity' of a text, and argues that an editorial approach focusing on reclaiming the 'original' text as intended by the author is an anachronistic approach. While this critical stance has its supporters as well as detractors,¹³³ what

¹²⁹ See above, p. 101 for the importance of the functions of *ordinatio* and *compilatio* in the act of reading and ordering a medieval manuscript. Also see Denis Renevey and Graham D. Caie, 'Introduction', *Medieval Texts in Context*, ed. Denis Renevey and Graham D. Caie (London and New York, 2008), pp. 1–9.

¹³⁰ Graham D. Caie, 'The Manuscript Experience: What Medieval Vernacular Manuscripts Tell Us about Authors and Texts', in *ibid.*, pp. 10–27, at p. 12.

¹³¹ See Paul Zumthor, *Essai de poétique médiévale*, Collection poétique (Paris, 1972), and 'Intervocalite et mouvance', in *La lettre et la voix: De la 'littérature' médiévale*, Collection poétique (Paris, 1987), pp. 160–8. Zumthor's focus, however, was more on certain types of later medieval texts closely linked to the oral tradition (for example, *chansons de geste*, *fabliaux* or lyric poetry), and he explained 'mouvance' as a product of this oral culture, an 'intervocal' rather than 'intertextual' network of poetic composition. Also see Caie, 'The Manuscript Experience', pp. 12–18, particularly p. 14.

¹³² See Bernard Cerquiglioni, *Éloge de la variante: Histoire critique de la philologie* (Paris, 1989), who prefers this term because of the association of Zumthor's term 'mouvance' with oral tradition, see *ibid.*, p. 54 and p. 120, n. 19.

¹³³ For an extension of this approach to English medieval literature, see Tim William Machan, *Textual Criticism and Middle English Texts* (Charlottesville and London, 1994),

is significant for our perception of the evolution of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* is the notion that textual variation and modification could be linked with anonymity of authorship. Both Zumthor and Cerquiglini draw attention to the conscious intervention of the scribe/compiler in the transmission of medieval poetry and romance, particularly when the text was not the intellectual property of a single named author.¹³⁴ Though 'mouvance' or 'variance' can in no way be said to be the defining characteristic of all medieval texts, this approach can certainly be usefully applied to some examples of historiography, particularly the anonymous tradition of vernacular historiography represented by the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. In the case of the *Chronicle*, its past history of manuscript transmission, compilation and scribal intervention indicates that the scribes and compilers play an important role in modifying its form and content. It is also logical to assume that this conscious intervention and modification is directly linked to the long tradition of anonymous authorship of the various *Chronicle* versions, and may also result in the generic hybridity that becomes a feature of the *Chronicle* in the twelfth century. However, we also need to be aware that this fluidity is bounded by an awareness of form and function, and despite its negotiations with alternative generic formats, the *Chronicle* at both Canterbury and Peterborough never loses its sense of appropriate content, or the evidence of formal markers like annal numbers and formulaic narrative openings.

Modifications in a text are often heralded by visual signals, and this is particularly evident in the manuscript of the F text, where the compiler's thought process is indicated to a large extent by the erasures and additions to the text. Though the manuscript of E has no such overt signs, its neatness may indicate greater care in the production of the manuscript. The integration of content in all its stages definitely demonstrates great attention to the act of compilation. The inclusion of charter material indicates a reliance on the use of documentation as *auctoritates*, as well as an awareness that the *Chronicle* tradition had the potential to be modified and include alternative generic formats. This indicates that the role of the compiler was a central part of this historiographical tradition, and particularly important in creating a version of the *Chronicle* aimed at articulating the ideologies of its place of production. The extant state of the manuscript of F makes

and Bella Millett, 'Mouvance and the Medieval Author', in *Late-Medieval Religious Texts and their Transmission: Essays in Honour of A. I. Doyle*, ed. A. J. Minnis, York Manuscripts Conference 3 (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 9–20. For a more critical approach, see Nicolas Jacobs, 'Kindly Light or Foxfire? The Authorial Text Reconsidered', *A Guide to Editing Middle English*, ed. Vincent P. McCarren and Douglas Moffat (Ann Arbor, 1998), pp. 3–14.

¹³⁴ See Zumthor, *Essai de poétique médiévale*, pp. 71–72, and Cerquiglini, *Éloge de la variante*, p. 58.

it impossible to judge its later use, but all the evidence indicates that the Peterborough manuscript of the *Chronicle* remained at the centre of evolving historiography at the abbey, being used as a source for *Hugh Candidus* in the twelfth century, as well as incorporating along its margins an Anglo-Norman *Brut* in the thirteenth century.¹³⁵

The evolution of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* is therefore directly related to the incorporation of alternative generic types. From the perspective of genre theory, this hybridity of the *Chronicle* shows the very dynamism of generic hierarchy that some Formalist theorists argue for. An evolutionary perspective with regard to generic change, as proposed by Tynanov, may be a useful model for considering the way in which the *Chronicle* is modified to suit immediate local needs in articulating identity.¹³⁶ In Tynanov's model of generic types, all genres are in a state of permanent revolution, which in turn accounts for the possibility of alterations and hybrid forms.¹³⁷ However, any theoretical consideration of generic hierarchy, however flexible, should be treated with a degree of caution with respect to the *Chronicle*. The idea of generic hierarchy assumes that mutation of generic types gives rise to an alternative which is, for that moment in time, assumed to be better than its previous incarnation. Though there is evidence to indicate that the twelfth-century proto-E *Chronicle* may have been ranked higher than the earlier recensions, there is no definite evidence that incorporating a hybrid element in the *Chronicle* created a text which could be ranked higher in a generic or formal hierarchy.

The formal hybridity of the *Chronicle* indicates a textual environment which is fluid and flexible in responding to the ideological needs of a community. Indeed, the flexibility of the annal format, its ability to incorporate modifications, and the skill of the compilers at both Canterbury and Peterborough in combining local and national history, testify to the *Chronicle's* ability to survive as a viable historiographical format. Despite change, the *Chronicle* tradition showed remarkable resilience, surviving alongside the alternative historiographical format of the house-history or cartulary at both Canterbury and Peterborough in the twelfth century.

¹³⁵ See Whitelock, *Peterborough Chronicle*, pp. 172–80.

¹³⁶ Tynanov considers the condition of genre as something that is constantly evolving rather than fixed in a hierarchy, see Yury Tynanov, 'The Literary Fact', in *Modern Genre Theory*, ed. David Duff (Harlow, 2000), pp. 29–49. Shklovsky also argued that 'a new form arises not in order to express a new content, but because the old form has extended its possibilities', see 'Introduction' in Duff, *Modern Genre Theory*, p. 7. However, this is not entirely applicable for the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, as the inclusion of charter material does represent the inclusion of new content, and a corresponding modification of format.

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 32–3.

The production and dissemination of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* in the twelfth century is an integral part of a much larger (and wide-spread) programme of scribal and compilatory activities. At Peterborough and Canterbury, it is at the heart of historiographical activity covering a range of texts, co-existing with alternative texts and hybrid forms, and incorporating hybrid elements within itself. However, there is no indication that this was because the form of the *Chronicle* was deemed inferior in any way; on the contrary, there is evidence to show that the version obtained by Canterbury and Peterborough was accorded particular status amongst Latin and vernacular historiography, perhaps even ranked higher over other *Chronicle* variants. It was modified far less than other *Chronicle* versions by the compiler of the F version at Canterbury, and its sacrosanct status was recognised at Peterborough as well. This implies a close connection between Canterbury and Peterborough in the transmission and use of the *Chronicle*, which goes beyond a simple movement of documents from one centre to another. The retention of the proto-E and its features during the rewriting at Peterborough, and the close copying of the annals in the Latin WA, also indicates an awareness of the *Chronicle* as a representative of the vernacular historiographical tradition. The text is also noted as a significant part of an earlier tradition of historiography by Henry of Huntingdon (who sees himself as a worthy successor), which further implies its popularity. The production of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* in the twelfth century is thus a testament to its longevity and cultural importance, despite being overshadowed by the sheer volume of historiography in Latin.

At Peterborough, the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* continues to be an integral part of the corpus of historiography drawn on by *Hugh Candidus*. However, while there is significant overlap between the earlier vernacular tradition and the later Latin house-history, there are also differences in form, content and style. This indicates a crystallisation of earlier ideological concerns, but also a shift towards new ones. The dynamics of text production at Peterborough following the *Chronicle*, and the interaction of this text with *Hugh Candidus*, form the subject of the next and final chapter.

Beyond the *Chronicle*: the perspective of house history

The Second Continuation of the *Peterborough Chronicle* ends on a note of hope and victory, with a new king, Henry II, on the throne of England, and a new abbot, William of Waterville, installed at Peterborough abbey. For the history of the abbey, as well as for historiography at the centre, this is a moment of equilibrium. In the text itself, the new abbot represents the possibility of a better future for the abbey, after it has recovered from the effects of internal and political upheavals, just as Henry II represents the same for the war-torn country. From a wider, and more ideological perspective, the vernacular and Latin articulations of abbey history are poised in harmonious co-existence, with the Latin documentation providing part of the material that was inserted in the *Chronicle*, and the vernacular text revalidating their existence.¹ The conclusion of the *Peterborough Chronicle* marks the end of a period that simultaneously witnessed the writing of the vernacular *Chronicle*, the construction of the Latin *Relatio Heddae*, and its further incorporation into the *Liber Niger*, the abbey's first complete cartulary. But the narrative of the abbey does not remain poised at this point forever. In the second half of the twelfth century, very soon after the second phase of the *Peterborough Chronicle*, the narrative of abbey history and fortunes is documented in another extended house-history in Latin. Like the vernacular text which preceded it, this narrative draws heavily on the documents contained in the *Relatio Heddae* and the *Liber Niger* to convey an ideologically motivated account of the abbey's glorious past, but also made use of later and more contemporary documentation not used by the two compilers of the *Chronicle*. This process of accretion continues well into the thirteenth century, when the composite body of earlier charters and documentation, supplemented with updated versions of this late twelfth-century Latin house-history, are compiled in the Peterborough cartularies of Robert of Swaffham and Walter of Whittlesey.² Local historiography, charter and diplomatic are further

¹ As narrated in 963 E; see Chapter 1, pp. 37–9.

² The cartulary of Robert of Swaffham is now Peterborough, Dean and Chapter, MS 1, and that of Walter of Whittlesey is London, British Library, Add. MS 39758. For a description of the manuscripts, see Martin, *Cartularies and Registers*, pp. 7–12 and 17–19 respectively.

augmented with texts obtained from the neighbouring areas, as these Peterborough cartularies become repositories not just for charters from other centres,³ but also for a version of the *Gesta Herewardi*, a text certainly originating from neighbouring Ely.⁴

The major focus of this study has, so far, been on the transformation of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* at Peterborough. The close textual analysis in the earlier chapters drew attention to the nuanced integration of local and national history in the *Chronicle*, and the articulate expression of the abbey's self-image as an ancient and glorious Petrine house.⁵ The analysis has also focussed on the continuation of the *Chronicle* at the centre, and the unique narrative voices associated with these phases. It has discussed the overlap between the material incorporated in the *Chronicle* and Latin historiography in the twelfth century,⁶ the hybridity of the vernacular historiographical form,⁷ and the strong links between Peterborough and Canterbury.⁸ The connections between these two centres in terms of shared personnel are particularly relevant, as the *Chronicle* version used at Peterborough was very likely obtained from Canterbury, and one which had already been modified earlier by the compiler of the F *Chronicle* at Christ Church. However, most significantly, the textual evidence pertaining to the retention of the Canterbury material at Peterborough indicates the possibility of a shared (perhaps even imported) editorial and compilatory stance, which implies that at Peterborough (as in its earlier phase at Canterbury), the twelfth-century proto-E *Chronicle* was accorded a greater textual status in comparison to the other (earlier) versions of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*.⁹ Therefore, the use of this particular twelfth-century version at Canterbury and Peterborough, and by a range of Latin historians and compilers, particularly for post-Conquest material, indicates that the tradition of vernacular history as represented by the *Chronicle* was an important part of historiography in the twelfth century. While it is true that the sheer volume of Latin historiography in this period argues for its popularity, and might detract from the relatively fewer instances of

³ For the so-called 'colonies' of *Medeshamstede*/Peterborough and the charters relevant to them in the Peterborough archive, see Kelly, ed., *Charters of Peterborough Abbey*, pp. 67–78.

⁴ This is incorporated in the cartulary of Robert of Swaffham, fols 320–39, see Martin, *Cartularies and Registers*, p. 12. While Hereward may well have been a heroic figure in the Fenland area, Peterborough narrative is decidedly hostile to him on account of a raid on the abbey, where a number of treasures were plundered, see Chapter 1, pp. 44–9.

⁵ This is particularly apparent in the interpolations from charters, see Chapter 1, pp. 29–44.

⁶ See Chapter 3, pp. 120–34.

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 135–41.

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 111–20.

⁹ See Baker, ed., *MS F*, pp. xxvii–lxxxi, and Irvine, ed., *MS E*, p. xliii.

the *Chronicle* being updated and maintained, simplistic notions of the dominance of Latin historiography should also be modulated by the strong possibility of sources shared between both Latin and vernacular historians.¹⁰ Both the *Chronicle* and contemporary Latin historians may have drawn on a composite range of information, though their end product may have been dictated by differing perceptions of the form and function of historiography, as well as local ideologies. The production and continuation of the *Chronicle* at Peterborough in the twelfth century is therefore part of a wider textual culture that is both dynamic and adaptable, modifying not just the content, but also the form and genre of historiography to suit the needs of the moment (and the centre of production).

At this stage, two characteristics of the *Peterborough Chronicle* need to be reiterated. One is the care with which the text was compiled and produced at Peterborough. The neatness of the manuscript copy indicates that this was a final copy, unlike the near contemporary F version at Canterbury, very much a work in progress.¹¹ The appearance of the manuscript (for example, the lettering and margins) also suggests that resources were lavished on this project, thus indicating its importance as an example of historiography, and as an artefact.¹² The preceding analysis has also drawn attention to the clever and seamless integration of the old and new portions of the text at the abbey, which also demonstrates the attention devoted to the narrative, and, in turn, its ideological importance for the community. As an articulation of the abbey's past and present, the *Peterborough Chronicle*, along with the *Relatio Heddae* and the *Liber Niger*, is indeed a powerful vehicle of abbey interests.

Linked to the construction of the *Chronicle* is a second significant point, namely, the presence of hybridity both within and without the text. The embedding of alternative genres within the *Chronicle* text may be seen as evidence of the evolution of the form of the *Chronicle* to cater to the textual and ideological needs of the community.¹³ Textual hybridity was a common feature of post-Conquest text production, and, in the case of Peterborough, the vernacular tradition co-existed in harmony with alternative forms of historiography like cartularies and house-histories, even serving to validate them (for example, the story of the *Relatio* being found in the ruins of the monastery is first narrated in the E text, and then again in later Peterborough narrative). However, though the boundaries of genre overlap, the E text is never,

¹⁰ See Chapter 3, particularly pp. 128–34.

¹¹ For the facsimiles of the versions, see Dumville, ed., *MS. F, Facsimile Edition*, and Whitelock, *The Peterborough Chronicle*.

¹² See Chapter 3, pp. 101–10.

¹³ See *ibid.*, pp. 135–42, particularly, pp. 137–41.

at any point, considered to be a replacement or substitute for a chronicle-cartulary. This also indicates an awareness of the function of historiography and an interest in its various forms, with the vernacular and Latin texts constructed to complement each other.

The writing of the vernacular *Chronicle* at Peterborough, its generic hybridity and textual cross-referencing, along with the simultaneous presence of Latin historiography, all indicate a long tradition of text production at the abbey.¹⁴ Furthermore, the concerted links between Latin and vernacular narrative indicate that both were equally important for the abbey, and that language was a concomitant part of the form and expression of historiographical narrative. If this is seen as the contextual background for the production of alternative forms of Latin historiography like chronicle-cartularies and house-histories at Peterborough in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, particularly after the writing of the *Peterborough Chronicle*, we may be able to discern modifications of form and function dictated by textual need and ideological intent, rather than by the ascendancy of Latin over the vernacular. This, in turn, can also provide a perspective on the overall function of historiography at the abbey over a period extending beyond the production of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. This is the perspective of this final chapter, which looks at the evolving needs for historiography at the centre. While the previous analysis focussed on the adaptation and modification of the vernacular text in the twelfth century, the subsequent analysis will consider the amalgam of factors that led to the production of Latin historiography following the *Chronicle* at Peterborough.

The Chronicle of Hugh Candidus

By 1175, the abbey produced a house-history in Latin, authored by a certain Hugh Candidus (or 'Hugo Albus', as he is referred to in the text itself).¹⁵ This text was originally part of the Peterborough cartulary that was Cotton MS Otho A xvii, and versions of it (with additions made by the compilers) are now extant in the Peterborough cartularies of Robert of Swaffham and Walter of Whittlesey.¹⁶ The

¹⁴ It is possible that this need may have been exacerbated by the fire of 1116, though we should be cautious about this supposition. While it may well have been the immediate reason for the acquisition of some texts, the tradition of textual borrowing and production may have preceded the fire, see *ibid.*, pp. 111–120, and there is evidence to suggest that the writing of the *Relatio* may have preceded the E text in the 1120s, see Chapter 1, pp. 32–3.

¹⁵ A later transcriber calls him Hugo Albus because of his pale complexion, but, though used by Leland, the name Hugh White has never quite taken off. Clarke refers to him as Hugo Candidus.

¹⁶ The cartulary of Robert of Swaffham was written around 1250, and Walter of Whittlesey's

version of *Hugh Candidus* extant in the Peterborough cartulary was destroyed during the Cottonian fire of 1731, and our ideas of what its contents may have been are based on a surviving transcript made by, or for, George Davenport (now Cambridge University Library, MS Dd. 14. 28). Hugh's narrative of the abbey proved enduring for future historiography at Peterborough, as it was modified and continued to 1256 by Robert of Swaffham, and later by Walter of Whittlesey to 1330, and was even made use of as late as the second half of the seventeenth century by Simon Gunton, vicar of Peterborough, for his magisterial narrative of the abbey.¹⁷

The continuing popularity of *Hugh Candidus* at Peterborough was undoubtedly an important factor in its later use and adaptation, but, from a more contemporary perspective, it was also a reflection of a common local trend in historiography in the twelfth century, particularly amongst the Fenland monasteries. Its comprehensive combination of documentation, local legend and historiography was a common and consistent feature of a number of contemporary local texts which claimed to represent the interests of the whole or part of the community.¹⁸ Around the same time as the writing of Hugh's text, the *Chronicon Abbatiae Rameseiensis* was compiled at Ramsey abbey (probably during the middle of the reign of Henry II, around the 1170s), and the *Liber Eliensis* from Ely was certainly written by the late twelfth century.¹⁹ It is likely that *Hugh Candidus* was one of the first house-histories produced in the area, and may even have been a trendsetter amongst the Fenland house-histories, combining charters, abbey documentation, local history and hagiography to cater for an audience that was possibly composed of both monastic and lay persons.²⁰ Linked by similar conditions of re-foundation and common or competing patrons, these Fenland monasteries and their narratives existed in a state of mutual cooperation and competition. While their importance decreased as centres of national power, they grew increasingly localised in their administration and outlook,²¹ even though, paradoxically, their references to charters and documentation

cartulary was constructed around 1322–29. See Martin, *Cartularies and Registers*, pp. xiii, 7–14 and 17–19.

¹⁷ Simon Gunton, *A history of the church of Peterborough wherein the most remarkable things concerning that place, from the first foundation thereof, with other passages of history not unworthy publick view, are represented*, Early English Books 1641–1700 (London, 1686).

¹⁸ See Paxton, 'Charter and Chronicle'.

¹⁹ For the Ramsey chronicle see W. D. Macray, ed., *Chronicon Abbatiae Rameseiensis*, RS 83 (London, 1886). The smaller houses of Thorney and Crowland produced no comparable house histories; Crowland, however, produced a forged chronicle in the mid fourteenth century, attributed to the eleventh-century abbot, Ingulf.

²⁰ See Jennifer Paxton, 'Textual Communities in the English Fenlands: a Lay Audience for Monastic Chronicles?', *Anglo-Norman Studies 26: Proceedings of the Battle Conference 2003*, ed. John Gillingham (Woodbridge, 2004), pp. 123–37.

²¹ Gransden, 'Traditionalism and Continuity', pp. 187–8.

make claims for a glorious and nationally important Anglo-Saxon heritage. This intense parochial perspective is evident in these house-histories which are almost in conversation with each other, referring to the same local incidents from their individual points of view.²² The *Liber Eliensis*, for example, was written from the viewpoint of the monks of the community who were dissatisfied with the rule of Bishop Nigel, and the *Chronicon* of Ramsey was written after the abbey's depredation during the Anarchy of Stephen's reign. Despite their parochial outlook, these texts exhibit similarities in form and format, in particular, the extensive use of archival resources in order to articulate their vision of the ideal monastic past. Paxton suggests that their similar format may indicate a consensus between these monasteries regarding this form of historiography. She has drawn attention to the way in which these Fenland house-histories, united in form yet divided in parochial ideology, could create textual communities, communicating a particular vision of history to lay as well as monastic audiences.²³ Broadly, this similar format in text construction does suggest competition in terms of historiographical output at the centres, as well as similar needs and ideologies when it comes to the purpose of this narrative.

One way of looking at *Hugh Candidus* is to see it as part of a general historiographical trend in the Fenland area, and this has been the dominant focus so far. However, one also needs to consider the context and influence of historiography at the abbey itself, particularly the significant body of narrative in both Latin and vernacular, which precedes the writing of Hugh's text. Hugh's narrative, though very different in form and format from the earlier vernacular *Chronicle*, draws on similar sources. It makes use of a significant body of charters and documentation included in the *Relatio Heddae* and the *Liber Niger*, and possibly drew on a body of vernacular texts (both historiography and hagiography) that must have included the *Peterborough Chronicle*, even though this text is never explicitly mentioned. The production of this Latin house-history therefore raises two significant questions. The first is the extent to which this text owes a debt to past historiog-

²² For example, while Hereward is a hero in the narrative produced at Ely, he is clearly a traitor by Peterborough standards, see Chapter 1, pp. 44–9.

²³ See Paxton, 'Charter and Chronicle', pp. 221–5, for her discussion of Brian Stock's notion of 'textual communities' (Stock, *Implications of Literacy*, pp. 88–150) and its implications for the production of historiography in the Fenlands. The presence of texts in society necessarily assumes the presence of 'readers', and the formation of 'textual communities' indicates that social activity may be centred around particular texts, or a 'literate interpreter' of these texts who is responsible for their dissemination. This could be the 'textual' voice of a monastic institution or a monastic group, rather than as an individual. Similar methods of text construction link the house-histories of the various Fenland abbeys and thus suggest a consensual historical format.

raphy, particularly the earlier tradition of vernacular historiography as represented by the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. The second concerns the actual dynamics of its existence; why this text was at all necessary for the abbey over and above a significant corpus of historiography which included the *Relatio*, the *Liber Niger* and the *Peterborough Chronicle*.

Hugh Candidus and the Peterborough Chronicle

The little that we know about Hugh Candidus, the author, comes from the text itself, and its later interpolations. The version of Hugh's text in Swaffham's cartulary notes his recent passing away, and narrates the miraculous story of his recovery from a debilitating illness in youth.²⁴ We know that his brother Reinaldus Spiritus was the sacrist, and a prominent member of the community, and that the author was referred to as 'Hugo Albus' because of his pale complexion.²⁵ The text also notes his popularity within the community, and in neighbouring monasteries, though how much of that is conventional eulogy we cannot judge at this point. Hugh certainly rose to be sub-prior within the abbey, and seems to have played a prominent role in the election of William of Waterville as abbot.²⁶

We are not sure exactly when Hugh entered into the brotherhood (Mellows suggests 'we may think of him as born *circa* 1100'),²⁷ but it was obviously from a very young age, as a version of his Latin text notes that after he recovered from his boyhood illness, he was instructed and mentored by his brother, Reinaldus the sacrist, and the abbot Ernulf.²⁸ If indeed mentored by Ernulf, from a very young age Hugh would have been aware of the historiographical activity that was going on at the abbey in the twelfth century, particularly if we make the likely assumption that Ernulf's position as abbot of Peterborough, and his previous links with Canterbury, would have played some part in the transfer of texts from Canterbury to Peterborough (in particular the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*). It is therefore worth considering the extent to

²⁴ See Mellows, ed., *Chronicle of Hugh Candidus*, pp. 92–6 and W. T. Mellows and Charles Mellows, trans., *The Peterborough Chronicle of Hugh Candidus* (Peterborough, 1980), pp. 49–51.

²⁵ See Mellows, ed., *Hugh Candidus*, p. 95, 'Ex integro uero sanatus quia ... uocabatur albus Hugo quia albus facie erat decorus' (When he had thus recovered from illness ... he was called Hugh White because he was white and of a fair countenance; Mellows, trans., *Peterborough Chronicle*, p. 51).

²⁶ See Mellows, ed., *Hugh Candidus*, pp. 124–5, and Mellows, trans., *Peterborough Chronicle*, pp. 68–9. Also see Mellows, ed., *Hugh Candidus*, Introduction, pp. xvi–xvii.

²⁷ Mellows, ed., *Hugh Candidus*, Introduction, p. xvii.

²⁸ Ernulf became abbot of Peterborough in 1107, and was made bishop of Rochester in 1114.

which this historiographical activity that occurred in Hugh's boyhood and youth would influence the writing of his own narrative in which the author obviously displayed great diligence (according to the later transcriber in Swaffham's cartulary, he 'gathered the materials for this book, and when they were gathered, wrote it').²⁹

Ideology and expression

Hugh never explicitly refers to the *Peterborough Chronicle* as a source, or indeed to any of the texts that preceded his narrative. The *Relatio Heddae* too is never directly mentioned as a source, though Hugh narrates the story of 'ancient privileges' (*antiqua priuilegia*) being found in the abbey walls, and their great textual authority with regard to the rights and privileges enjoyed by the abbey, though (unlike the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*) he does not mention Abbot Hedda by name in this instance.³⁰ The Prologue to Hugh's narrative as extant in the later cartularies of Swaffham and Whittlesey (which may not have been part of the original version of Hugh's Latin text) also makes the usual historiographical claim of veracity, claiming to set down nothing except that which was recorded in 'the writings of old time', therefore making only a generalised reference to the entire corpus of historiography accessed by this narrative, rather than referring to specific source materials.³¹

Nevertheless, both the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* at Peterborough and *Hugh Candidus* demonstrate a focus on the fortunes of the abbey, and thus obviously narrate a number of incidents in common. The early history of the abbey in particular is more or less parallel in the E text and *Hugh Candidus*. Both the vernacular *Chronicle* and *Hugh Candidus* draw on the corpus of grants and charters detailing the foundation of the abbey, as well as subsequent grants by Anglo-Saxon royalty or eminent ecclesiastical personages, though Hugh provides more detail in a number of cases. While the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* merely records the refoundation of the abbey by Æthelwold, and focuses more on the dynamics of King Edgar's grant (motivated by the discovery of the *Relatio* in the abbey walls), Hugh narrates the story of how the Lord appeared to Æthelwold in a vision and led him to the burnt and ravaged site of *Medeshamstede*. The bishop is then helped in his endeavours by the queen, and also by Adulf, a chancellor of King

²⁹ Mellows, ed., *Hugh Candidus*, p. 93 and Mellows, trans., *Peterborough Chronicle* p. 49.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 31 and p. 17 respectively. However, Hugh does name an Abbot Hedda at *Medeshamstede* in the second half of the ninth century, see Mellows, ed., *Hugh Candidus*, pp. 22–3.

³¹ See Mellows, ed., *Hugh Candidus*, p. 3 and Mellows, trans., *Peterborough Chronicle*, p. 1.

Edgar. Adulf, wanting to do penance at St Peter's in Rome for the accidental death of his only son, is steered by Æthelwold towards directing his energies and resources into the restoration of the abbey, also dedicated to St Peter.³² Indeed, it is this extra detail that draws attention not just to the different narrative style between the texts, but also to what constitutes dramatic narrative in them. In the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, the Interpolations create a sense of drama by translating the charters as a dramatic moment in time, and the grants as a speech act.³³ Hugh, on the other hand, clearly refers to them as documents, and provides extracts from them. The dramatic element in his narrative lies in the extra particulars, the prayers and visions of the characters concerned, or the miracles which lead to a fortunate outcome for the abbey.³⁴ It also points to a difference in narrative intention, which can make it difficult in places to discern direct links between the earlier vernacular *Chronicle* and the later Latin house-history. A case in point, for example, is the narrative of Hereward's raid on the abbey. Annal 1070 in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* inserts the Peterborough version of events within the pre-existing inherited annal, seamlessly integrating it within an existing narrative framework. A sense of loss is conveyed not just through the actions of the raiders, but through the absence of any detail regarding the treasures stolen.³⁵ The E text also provides no indication as to whether the abbey made good these losses, conveying through the starkness of the narrative a sense of loss and desolation. Hugh, on the other hand, not only provides a detailed list of the objects stolen by the raiders but also narrates the story of how Yware, a resourceful member of the community, was able to recover some of the treasures carried away.³⁶ We can logically assume that it is unlikely that these extra details (undoubtedly part of abbey legend and probably well established by the time the E text was written) were unknown to the first compiler of the *Peterborough Chronicle*, so a probable reason for the silence of the E text is its focus on the dramatic impact of the narrative, and the absolute sense of loss conveyed. On the other hand, both texts indicate that, despite the narrative differences, there is some information that could not be verified. The annal in E, for example, has a blank space for the location of the place where the treasures were carried by

³² See Mellows, ed., *Hugh Candidus*, pp. 29–31 and Mellows, trans., *Peterborough Chronicle* pp. 17–18.

³³ See Chapter 1, pp. 29–41.

³⁴ The importance of the miraculous in the construction of the text, and its implications for our perception of the function of historiography are discussed below, pp. 159–68.

³⁵ See above, Chapter 1, pp. 44–7.

³⁶ See Mellows, ed., *Hugh Candidus*, pp. 77–9 and Mellows, trans., *Peterborough Chronicle* pp. 40–3, as well as the discussion below, pp. 159–68.

the raiders, and Hugh too does not name the place. Both texts are also unified in their condemnation of Hereward, in stark contrast to his heroic portrayal in the *Gesta Herewardi* originating from Ely, a text incorporated later in the thirteenth century in the Peterborough cartulary of Swaffham.

While differences in narrative styles and focus between the earlier vernacular and the later Latin history are easily discerned, there are more subtle connections between the two texts. Some sections of Hugh's text seem to imply a direct awareness of the language and expression of his vernacular predecessors. Mellows, the editor of Hugh's text, suggests that these become more and more frequent from 1066, and he sees correspondences in language and expression between annals 1066, 1102, 1103, 1116 and 1135 in the E text and Hugh's narrative, and concludes that 'there can ... be little doubt that [Hugh Candidus] did use E. Pb [i.e. the E text], but whether he did so after its incorporation in the chronicle of the Laud MS. or whether he had access to the materials from which the insertions were made, must remain uncertain'. It is certainly logical to assume that the E text in its entirety would have been completed by the time Hugh is writing his history (definitely in the latter half of the twelfth century, possibly the 1170s), and if, as his own narrative tells us, he was mentored by Ernulf, it is very likely (though hard to prove definitively) that he was fully aware of the historiographical activity at the centre, and the range of texts which preceded his Latin house-history.

The links in language and expression between the two texts may therefore suggest the use of the vernacular *Chronicle* as a source for Hugh's narrative. For Mellows, the most striking instance of correspondence between the two texts was annal 1135 E, and the corresponding narrative in Hugh's text. This is the account of the death of Henry I, where the language of the later narrative parallels in places the preceding vernacular narrative.³⁷ More than anything else, Mellows saw this similarity in language and expression as proof that Hugh drew directly on the *Peterborough Chronicle*.³⁸

³⁷ Compare for example, 'þa þestrede þe dæi ouer al landes, 7 uuard þe sunne suilc als it uware threniht ald mone an sterres abuten him at mid dæi ... Wurþen men suiðe ofuundred 7 ofdred 7 sæden ð micel þing sculde cumen hereafter ... sua dide for þat ilc gear uuarth þe king ded ... þa þestre[de] sona þas landes' (See Irvine, ed., *MS E*, p. 133, and Swanton, *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicles*, pp. 262–3) with 'et sicut scriptum est in pluribus locis subito illa hora celi contenebrati sunt et sol facta est quasi esset luna, tribus uel quatuor horis, et stella appareuerunt ... et plurimi dixerunt hoc portentum magnam rem significare ... Et uerum dixerunt, quia eodem anno defunctus est rex ... Tunc contenebrata est terra' (see Mellows, ed., *Hugh Candidus*, p. 104 and Mellows, trans., *Peterborough Chronicle*, p. 56).

³⁸ See Mellows, ed., *Hugh Candidus*, pp. xxviii–xxix; for the overall similarities between the two texts see pp. xx–xxix.

Another striking instance is the narrative of the installation of Henry of Saint-Jean-d'Angély as abbot of Peterborough, annal 1127 in the E text. Both texts note that Henry persuaded the king to grant him the abbacy because he claimed (dupliciously) that he had left his earlier abbey because of discord, and on the advice of the pope and the abbot of Cluny. Henry's career path is exactly parallel in both texts,³⁹ as is the logical progression of the narrative. Also striking is the similarity in language and expression,⁴⁰ particularly in the narrative of the Wild Hunt.⁴¹ Likewise both texts record the same details of his departure from the abbey of Saint-Jean d'Angély, though Hugh goes on to provide some extra details about Henry wanting to make his nephew Gerard his successor, which the vernacular *Chronicle* does not have.

These correspondences in narrative logic and expression between Hugh's narrative and that of his predecessors (the two continuators of the *Peterborough Chronicle*) suggest that, for part of the Latin house-history dealing with twelfth-century Peterborough, the vernacular *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* was the most likely source. This is not unusual, given the importance of the vernacular *Chronicle* as a source for contemporary and later Latin historiography.⁴² It also suggests the validity of the earlier historiographical tradition within the community, and provides strong evidence of the continuing culture of text production at Peterborough in this period, particularly if we

³⁹ First he was bishop in Soissons, then a monk and subsequently prior in Cluny, and then prior in Savigny [Souvigny]. He also acquired the abbacy of Saint-Jean-d'Angély, and even the archbishopric of Besançon and the bishopric of Saintes. Also see Chapter 2, pp. 76–7, n. 55.

⁴⁰ Compare for example 1127 E 'eall þæt he mihte taken wiðunnen 7 wiðuten, of læred 7 of læwed, swa he sende ouer sæ; 7 na god þær ne dide ne na god ðær ne læuede' (see Irvine, ed., *MS E*, p. 129, and Swanton, *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicles*, pp. 256–57) with 'Cum uenisset autem sicut diximus prefatus abbas ad monasterium mansit ibi pene uno anno, et accepit homagium et pecuniam de militibus et de tota abbacia et nichil boni ibi fecit, set totum misit et portauit ad abbaciam suam' (see Mellows, ed., *Hugh Candidus*, p. 101 and Mellows, trans., *Peterborough Chronicle*, p. 55).

⁴¹ Compare 1127 E '...þa son þæræfter þa sægon 7 herdon fela men feole huntes hunten: ða huntes wæron sarte 7 micle 7 ladlice, 7 here hundes ealle swarte 7 bradegede 7 ladlice, 7 hi ridone on swarte hors 7 on swarte bucces. Þis wæs segon on þe selue derfald in þa tune of Burch 7 on ealle þa wudes ða wæron fram þa selua tune to Stanforde, 7 þa muneces herdon ða horn blawen þæt hi blewon on nihtes. Soðfeste men heom kepten on nihtes; sæidon, þes þe heom þuhte, þæt þær mihte wel ben abuton twenti oðer þritti hornblaweres. Þis wæs sægon 7 herd fram þæt he pider com eall þæt lentetid on an to Eastren.' (See Irvine, ed., *MS E*, p. 129, and Swanton, *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicles*, p. 258) with Hugh's narrative, 'Eodem anno cum uenisset ad abbaciam, uisa sunt et audita monstra per totam quadragesimam, et in noctibus, et per siluas et per plana a monasterio usque ad Stanford. Nam uisi sunt quasi uenatores cum cornibus et canubis, set omnes nigerimi errant et equi eorum et canes, et aliqui quasi edos equitabant, et oculos grandes habebant, et erant quasi uiginti aut triginta simul. Hoc non est falsum, quia plurimi ueracissimi homines uiderunt et audierunt cornua.' (see Mellows, ed., *Hugh Candidus*, p. 101 and Mellows, trans., *Peterborough Chronicle*, pp. 54–5).

⁴² Chapter 3, pp. 120–34.

bear in mind that the work of the Second Continuator would have immediately preceded Hugh's endeavour.⁴³ The scribe of the Second Continuation in the *Peterborough Chronicle* has also been associated with the production of the *Liber Niger*, a text that Hugh certainly would have been aware of, and drawn on, as a repository for the land grants relevant to the abbey.⁴⁴ This further suggests a core group of people at the abbey working on historiographical texts, who would very likely have drawn on each other's projects. It is also significant that Hugh makes no mention of the Anarchy, though he does note, like the E text, that Stephen was a mild man, and that there was much tribulation in the land. But, very unlike the Second Continuator's morbid interest in the mechanisms of torture, Hugh merely notes that he did not intend to 'chronicle all the evils which were borne by the monks, for many have written much thereon'.⁴⁵ It is a tantalising possibility that Hugh is here referring not just to the narrative in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* written by his immediate predecessor, but also to the whole corpus of shared narratives of the Anarchy that the *Chronicle* itself might have drawn on. The possibility of shared source material between Latin and vernacular historians, particularly for narratives of this period, has already been noted, and Hugh's omission of this period of history from his narrative may not just reflect the work of his immediate predecessor, but may also be an indirect corroboration of the presence of parallel narratives of this turbulent period, and their widespread use amongst contemporary chroniclers.⁴⁶

All this seems to imply that Hugh saw his text as a concomitant part of a continuing tradition of historiography at Peterborough, rather than as a departure from it. It is significant that the similarities in expression and narrative between Hugh's text and the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* are more apparent for twelfth-century events, particularly for the section written at Peterborough as part of the First and Second Continuations. By comparison, even though the early history of the abbey is a point of significant overlap between the two narratives, the similarities in narrative expression and logic are far less. Nevertheless, this narrative of the abbey's glorious past forms a significant part of the ideological impact of all historiography produced at the centre, and therefore it is important to consider the way in which this sense

⁴³ We can conclude from his retrospective narrative that he was writing in the 1150s, not long before Hugh's text.

⁴⁴ See Chapter 3, pp. 105–10, for the scribal associations between Peterborough texts.

⁴⁵ 'In huius regis tempore in maximis tribulacionibus et angustiis erat ecclesia sancta per totam terram, et ecclesia Burgensis cum aliis. Set non proposuimus omnia mala que gerebantur monachis scriber, quia multi multa scripserunt.' See Mellows, ed., *Hugh Candidus*, p. 105 and Mellows, trans., *Peterborough Chronicle*, p. 57.

⁴⁶ For a discussion of this possibility, see Chapter 3, pp. 128–34.

of identity is articulated in the E text and Hugh's Latin house-history, particularly through the use of possessions and documentation.

Grants, gifts and documentation

Though the 'writings of old time' referred to in a version of Hugh's text do not make direct reference to the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* or the *Relatio Heddae*, the phrase echoes the emphasis on the veracity of the written word, and the importance of written records for articulating abbey history. In this, it is reminiscent of the story of the ancient documents found in the ruined abbey walls recorded in the E text, which not only serve to validate Peterborough's glorious past, but also, in the narrative, serve as the basis for new grants and associated documentation, a story which, in turn, is repeated and revalidated by Hugh's narrative.

The necessity and importance of making reference to a body of earlier documentation is apparent in both the *Peterborough Chronicle* and *Hugh Candidus*, though their attitudes differ slightly in the particulars. Generally, Hugh is much fuller than the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* in making reference to the charters. This may be due to a number of factors. Hugh, revisiting the charters at period later than the first compiler of the vernacular *Chronicle*, certainly had access to a greater body of documentation, and thus included more detail. However, the charters incorporated in both texts exhibit the same documentary fallacy of guaranteeing past and future grants (as they would have in their extant versions separate to these narratives), and both chroniclers pay close attention to the accuracy of the bounds and witness lists, highlighting them as the most significant (and presumably the most permanent) parts of the documentation referred to in the text. Yet despite the greater body of documentation included in Hugh's Latin house-history, there is a sense in this text, as there is in the vernacular *Peterborough Chronicle*, that this narrative is not a substitute for a cartulary. While the E text portrayed the grants as a dramatic act of giving and receiving, Hugh claims to give 'extracts' from King Edgar's grant rather than the full charter. This indicates that though spaced apart in terms of time of composition, and as well as being different in language, both the E text and *Hugh Candidus* show a clear awareness of the form and function of hybrid historiographical narrative, and are conscious of the extent to which the formal structure can be manipulated for the demands of the narrative. It is a distinction that would become more confused in the versions of Hugh's text in the compilations made by Swaffham and Whittlesey. Swaffham, in his version of Hugh's text, for example, removes the paraphrase of the witness-list to Wulfhere's charter, and inserts a reference to the full text in the cartulary section of the manuscript (thus implying the

narrative's function *within* the cartulary), while Whittlesey, on the other hand, reinserts the paraphrase.⁴⁷

However, where Hugh really departs from the E text is in his attitude to the recording of the land grants. The vernacular text is content to note the details of the properties acquired by the abbey, the bounds and the witness lists, and makes the act of granting land and property a simple, one-step, act. *Hugh Candidus*, on the other hand, records in far greater detail the particulars of how the property was acquired, and to whom it may have originally belonged. This is applicable not just for the later land transactions recorded by Hugh (but not mentioned in the E text),⁴⁸ but also for grants as early as King Wulfhere's foundation charter. In noting the extent of Wulfhere's royal bounty, Hugh notes, 'His own possessions he bestowed on her as a free gift, but the land that belonged to others, whether his great men or his thegns, these he got by exchange and gave to her, or bought for them for her by his privy purse.'⁴⁹ There is greater awareness in this later text of the legal implications of the lands that Peterborough claimed to own, and the extent to which it could justly claim to own these in perpetuity.⁵⁰ In recording lands obtained by the abbey under the abbacy of Leofric, Hugh attempts to record some eleventh-century land transactions, particularly because he feels the need to put this narrative in writing, lest these transactions, and the stories associated with them, be consigned to oblivion. He laments the inadequacy of records and the carelessness of scribes, but also explicitly mentions the omission of those lands recorded in the 'ancient privileges', the *Relatio Heddae* (the discovery of which is noted by Hugh exactly as the E text records it) as well as those acquired by Æthelwulf or Adulf.⁵¹

⁴⁷ See Kelly, ed., *Charters of Peterborough Abbey*, p. 135. A fuller version of Wulfhere's charter, in a 'single-sheet' format, also makes its appearance in the fourteenth century, see *ibid.*, pp. 144–54.

⁴⁸ For example, the lands obtained by Leofric (Fiskerton, Fletton and Burghley), transactions under Abbot Brand, and Matthew Ridel (Pythchley) to name a few.

⁴⁹ 'Fines possessionum seu extent linea attribuit, que sua propria errant dono donauit, que uero aliena uel optimatum uel etiam comitum suorum aut mutuatus est aut de proprio emit' (Mellows, ed., *Hugh Candidus*, p. 10 and Mellows, trans., *Peterborough Chronicle*, p. 5).

⁵⁰ A number of Hugh's sources have not survived, but he does provide evidence of not just property alienation, but also extortions under Norman kings. See Edmund King, *Peterborough Abbey 1086–1310: A Study in the Land Market* (Cambridge, 1973), p. 2. For an overview of Peterborough property in the period that Hugh was writing, see *ibid.*, pp. 6–34. For a study of the way in which charters articulate concerns about land and property, see Scott T. Smith, *Land and Book: Literature and Land Tenure in Anglo-Saxon England* (Toronto, 2012), and a review of the same by Jorgensen (Alice Jorgensen, 'Scott T. Smith. *Land and Book: Literature and Land Tenure in Anglo-Saxon England*', *RES* 65 (2014), 342–3).

⁵¹ These claims by Hugh have been mentioned elsewhere, see Mellows, ed., *Hugh Candidus*, pp. 67–8 and Mellows, trans., *Peterborough Chronicle*, p. 35.

This may be an act of cross-referencing, validating the existence of documentation which has a separate and discrete entity outside the boundaries of the Latin house-history, but it may also indicate that Hugh was aware that these examples of earlier documentation used by the abbey to make its claims of greatness were also more difficult to verify. This possible awareness of the suspect nature of much of the earlier documentation accessed by these texts is concomitant with Hugh's focus on the validity of land transactions.

Hugh pays great attention to the actual dynamics of land grants and transactions, in comparison to the E text, focussing on rental agreements and leases,⁵² market rights,⁵³ and other money transactions involved.⁵⁴ It is this detailed perspective on acquisitions which is an abiding feature of Hugh's text, and in noting the second papal bull of Eugenius concerning the sacristy at Burch, Hugh writes: 'These bulls and immunities Abbot Martin acquired at Rome, and, because our pen is still writing of these matters, let no king or prince or any powerful person, whether ecclesiastical or lay, rashly remove, retain, or diminish, these same possessions from the office of the sacristy, or presume to harass them with any kind of annoyances.'⁵⁵ The possibility that these privileges may be eroded by nobility or royalty is indeed a far cry from the claims made in the vernacular *Chronicle*

⁵² Hugh notes, for example, how Matthew Ridel let the manor of Pytchley to his brother Geoffrey Ridel to farm during the reign of Abbot Godric. Geoffrey initially refused to surrender his rights after the abbot's death, but did come to an agreement that the property would revert to the abbey after his death, without contest from his family. Hugh records some complex land transactions here; Geoffrey was supposed to pay four pounds of silver to the monastery every year for as long as he held the manor of Pytchley, but died very soon after this pact was made, so even though Abbot John seized the land, he gave the king sixty silver marks to pre-empt any dispute. See Mellows, ed., *Hugh Candidus*, pp. 88–9, and Mellows, trans., *Peterborough Chronicle*, pp. 46–7.

⁵³ The charter of King Edgar in Hugh's text states: 'Mercatum quoque constituimus in Burch singular, ut nullum aliud habeatur inter Stanford et Huntadune, et ad illud damus ibidemque persolui iubemus totum sine ulla contradiccione theloneum' (And we will that there be a market in Burch, single in its kind, and that none other will be held betwixt Stamford and Huntingdon, and to that we give and order to be paid all toll without any gainsaying); see Mellows, ed., *Hugh Candidus*, pp. 35–6, and Mellows, trans., *Peterborough Chronicle*, p. 19.

⁵⁴ Leofric, for example, gives the king twenty gold marks for Fiskerton, and eight gold marks for Fletton, which had been willed to the abbey by Leviva of London, but which the king and queen had attempted to take away. Likewise Hugh notes that Leofric also gave eight gold marks for Burghley, which had been leased to Ælfgar, a chaplain of the queen, to farm for his lifetime, but which also the king and queen attempted to take away. This demonstrates Hugh's meticulous record of the financial process of acquiring, or re-acquiring, property that the abbey claimed as its own. Mellows, ed., *Hugh Candidus*, pp. 67–8 and Mellows, trans., *Peterborough Chronicle*, p. 35.

⁵⁵ 'Hec priuilegia et immuniciones abbas Martinus Rome adquisit et quia stilus noster adhuc in his est nullus igitur rex uel princeps seu quilibet persona potens ecclesiastica uel secularis hec eadem bona ab officio sacristie temere remouere auferre retinere minuere seu quibuslibet molestiis fatigare presumat'; see Mellows, *Hugh Candidus*, p. 118, and Mellows, trans., *Peterborough Chronicle*, p. 65.

regarding the generosity of Anglo-Saxon royalty, but it is a measure of Hugh's pragmatic awareness of the legal and ideological importance of documentation.

This focus on the possessions of the abbey, and any losses in this regard, remains a consistent feature of Hugh's text, as the abbey's material resources consisted not just of land and rents, but also of valuable things like books, vestments and relics. Hugh provides a more comprehensive inventory of these materials than does the vernacular *Chronicle*, noting, for example, Abbot Brand's and Abbot Leofric's gifts in detail.⁵⁶ The Latin text is also conscious about recording any losses, particularly those incurred by the abbey during the raid of Hereward.⁵⁷ Indeed, one of the most significant differences between the E text and Hugh's *Chronicle* is the lack of mention of the arm of St Oswald in the former. This was undoubtedly one of Peterborough's most prized relics,⁵⁸ and was stolen during the raid of 1070. Hugh reports how this treasure, along with some members of the Peterborough community, was taken to Ely, and there Prior Æthelwold somehow contrived to retrieve this precious relic when the Danes were feasting, and managed to smuggle it on to the abbey of Ramsey for safekeeping. Likewise, for some of the other relics plundered by the raiders, Yware the sacristan was actually able to recover them from as far away as Denmark and send them back to the abbey.⁵⁹ Hugh also narrates in detail the acquisition of the body of St Florentin from the monastery of Bonneval by Abbot Ælfsige, while in Normandy with Queen Emma. The abbot, finding a monastery ravaged by famine and in confusion, is able to negotiate a good deal to purchase the body of the saint (minus the head), as well as his shrine, for five hundred pounds of silver.⁶⁰ It seems to be a shrewd investment for the abbey, as this relic is frequently visited by pilgrims from the continent, thus bringing valuable income to the abbey (and

⁵⁶ Abbot Brand's gifts are detailed *ibid.*, pp. 41 and 71–2, and pp. 21 and 36–7 respectively.

⁵⁷ A version of Hugh's text in Whittlesey's cartulary, for example, even notes that some property was alienated during the abbacy of Martin (even though the abbey benefitted overall), but no further details about this alienated property is mentioned in Hugh's texts, though both Hugh and the E text record the lands obtained by the abbot during the period of the Anarchy.

⁵⁸ 'Habetur autem inibi quod super omne aurum preciosum est dextrum brachium sancti Osuualdi regis et martiris integrum in carne et cute manens, iuxta uotum benedictionis sancti Aidani episcopi' (There is kept there a thing more precious than gold, even the right arm of S. Oswald, king and martyr, abiding entire and uncorrupted alike in its flesh and skin, according to the prayer of Bishop Aidan when he blessed it); see Mellows, ed., *Hugh Candidus*, p. 52 and Mellows, trans., *Peterborough Chronicle*, p. 28). Hugh's text also contains a set of verses, see *ibid.*

⁵⁹ See Mellows, ed., *Hugh Candidus*, pp. 82–3, and Mellows, trans., *Peterborough Chronicle* pp. 42–3.

⁶⁰ See *ibid.*, p. 49 and p. 26 respectively.

taking income away from Bonneval).⁶¹ This level of detail, and Hugh's subtle hint that Bonneval's compliance with Ælfsige's offer was under duress, is entirely absent from the E text.

These are not the only relics that Hugh talks about, though their mention gives Hugh the opportunity to give a detailed list of all the artefacts installed at the abbey.⁶² These relics count as the material possessions of the abbey, and therefore constitute part of its wealth. But they also require narrative contextualising them and explaining their importance, so that they can connect the abbey to a wider lay and monastic public, and be considered as important sources of abbey income.⁶³ These narratives of the relic possessions of the abbey (and their associations with a wider body of hagiographic literature) are a significant part of the narrative of Hugh's Latin house-history, which suggests the growing importance of such texts and artefacts for the community at Peterborough. But from a formal point of view, the inclusion of this material in *Hugh Candidus* may have a more important role to play in the dynamics of text production at Peterborough. It represents a transition from an earlier annalistic tradition of historiography to a form more responsive to contemporary concerns, and may provide an insight into the reasons why this later Latin house-history was so important for the abbey, even though there was a substantial body of Latin and vernacular historiography that preceded it.

Saints, miracles, and a reason for existence

The miraculous in the vernacular E text is limited to portents heralding an event of significance, or the reporting of strange natural events. A significant part of this belongs to the received version of the *Chronicle*, and even if we consider only the post-Conquest narrative in the E text, there are a number of instances of thunder and lightning (1085, and 1117 E), bad weather, famine and disease (1086 E, coinciding with the death of the Conqueror, 1095, 1096 and 1103 E), eclipses, comets and strange portentous signs in the heavens (1097, 1098, 1106, 1110, 1114 and 1121 E), earthquakes (1119E) and blood welling from the earth or water (this is particularly common in Berkshire, in 1098, 1100,

⁶¹ The monks of Bonneval subsequently complained about this transaction, *ibid.*

⁶² See Mellows, ed., *Hugh Candidus*, pp. 53–5, and Mellows, trans., *Peterborough Chronicle*, pp. 28–9. Hugh also makes reference to other resting places of saints and relics clearly referring to the Kentish Royal Legend, see *ibid.*, pp. 56–64 and 30–3 respectively. The source text is printed in Felix Liebermann, ed., *Die Heiligen Englands* (Hanover, 1889), articles 5–14, pp. 4–10. Also see Mellows, ed., *Hugh Candidus*, pp. xxx–xxxiii, and D. W. Rollason, 'Lists of Saints' Resting Places in Anglo-Saxon England', *ASE* 7 (1978), 61–93.

⁶³ Relics could be important sources for lay participation, raising funds for buildings, encouraging donations, and even being a part of judicial processes, see D. W. Rollason, *Saints and Relics in Anglo-Saxon England* (Oxford, 1989), pp. 164–95.

coinciding with the death of William Rufus, and 1103 E).⁶⁴ Similar portents and upheavals of nature are noted in both continuations at Peterborough. The portion of the text to 1131, for example, notes great winds and fires over land and sea (1122 and 1131), floods (1125), earthquakes (1129, coinciding with a great heresy, the choice of two popes), ravaging fire (1123, the town of Lincoln burns down the very year that Alexander takes up the bishopric), and (the most striking of all) fearsome riders all dressed in black in the same year that Abbot Henry arrives at Peterborough (1127). The next phase of the Peterborough text also notes the portentous darkening of the sky which marks the death of Henry I in 1135, the barrenness of the earth (which reads like a stark correlation to the chaos and disorder of the Anarchy under Stephen's reign) in 1137, and a solar eclipse in 1140. These portents may be linked with significant events through association (particularly in retrospect), but in most cases they provide a sub-text of the strange and the miraculous affecting the human world, rather than an explicit narrative of divine intervention.

Hugh's narrative, on the other hand, demonstrates a sustained focus on the miraculous. We may assume that some of it was certainly due to personal interests, perhaps even familial inclinations. Hugh's brother Reinaldus the sacrist was said to have possessed the gift of prophecy, and Hugh's house-history narrates how he accurately foretold the death of some of the members of the community.⁶⁵ Unlike the mention of signs and portents in the E text, the miraculous in Hugh's text is always part of a bigger divine scheme for the abbey, made explicit through the narrative. The abbey's wheel of fortunes and misfortunes is highlighted in Hugh's account of how the Devil appears to the sick Æthelric (formerly bishop of York and Durham, who retired to Peterborough at the end of his life) and makes three prophesies of doom.⁶⁶ Hereward's raid on the abbey turns out to fulfil the first of these prophesies, an incident narrated in great detail by Hugh. The fire that devastated the abbey in 1116 is the second of the disasters foretold, and this too is seen as part of a bigger, divine plan

⁶⁴ Some of these may be seen as portents in retrospect, though their explanation in medieval texts may remain deeply ambivalent. See for example, Sarah Foot, 'Plenty, Portents and Plague: Ecclesiastical Readings of the Natural World in Early Medieval Europe', *God's Bounty? The Churches and the Natural World*, ed. Peter Clarke and Tony Claydon (Woodbridge, 2010), pp. 15–41, particularly pp. 25–32. Such portents and disasters are also used as connective tissue to link the Interpolations in the E text with the earlier narrative in the proto-E. See the detailed analysis of the disaster *topoi* in Chapter 1, pp. 52–7.

⁶⁵ Mellows, ed., *Hugh Candidus*, pp. 91–2 and Mellows, trans., *Peterborough Chronicle*, pp. 48–9.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 76 and p. 39 respectively. First the monks would be driven out, and the church goods despoiled. The second was that the monastery would be destroyed by fire. The third (which did not come to pass at the time that Hugh was writing) was that some of the brethren would kill each other and the monastery would be destroyed.

to test the abbey's ability to survive in adverse conditions.⁶⁷ The E text, on the other hand, in its omission of these details provided by Hugh, provides a stark and desolate picture of total loss and devastation, though we do know that a section of the abbey survived the fire. It has already been noted that it is only Hugh's account of the raid of Hereward which mentions the loss, and subsequent retrieval, of the arm of St Oswald, one of Peterborough's most precious relics.⁶⁸ St Oswald, though not a saint local to Peterborough, certainly plays a significant role in raising the profile of the abbey by working miracles through his appendage. One particular incident associated with this relic concerns Reinaldus Spiritus, Hugh's brother, who, on witnessing a man possessed by the demon within the precincts of the church, gave him the water with which the relic had been washed to drink, which effected a miraculous cure.⁶⁹ Hugh himself also handled this relic when it was displayed to Bishop Alexander during the abbacy of Martin,⁷⁰ and it is possible to speculate that both brothers may have had some kind of responsibility for this relic, though there is no evidence for this within the text itself. Hugh also narrates how this relic prompted King Stephen to dedicate his ring in the name of this saint, and the king also remitted forty marks that the abbey owed to the crown.⁷¹ The incorruptible nature of this relic is further described in Hugh's text by a set of verses and, in a way, it is the narrative of this artefact that highlights the most significant difference between *Hugh Candidus* and its vernacular predecessor.

One of the cornerstones of the later Latin house-history is the great attention that Hugh pays to the relics and saints associated with the abbey. As Geary notes, relics as physical objects do not have any intrinsic significance, but take on immense value when associated with external objects such as reliquaries or documents.⁷² They are therefore, in a sense, contextual artefacts, taking on meaning within the cultural and local context in which they are revered. Hugh's text gives the sense that not only are they integral to the material possessions of the abbey, but they also connect the abbey with a wider body of believers, and are important markers of the abbey's popularity in a local context. There is little sense of the importance of hagiographic

⁶⁷ Hugh provides details of how the devil is involved; see Mellows, ed., *Hugh Candidus*, pp. 97–9, and Mellows, trans., *Peterborough Chronicle*, pp. 52–3.

⁶⁸ See above, p. 158, and also Rollason, *Saints and Relics*, pp. 220–2.

⁶⁹ Mellows, ed., *Hugh Candidus*, p. 107 and Mellows, trans., *Peterborough Chronicle*, p. 58. For details of the wider cult of St Oswald, see Peter Clemoes, *The Cult of St Oswald on the Continent*, Jarrow Lecture 1983 (Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 1984).

⁷⁰ Mellows, ed., *Hugh Candidus*, p. 52 and Mellows, trans., *Peterborough Chronicle*, p. 28 respectively.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 106 and pp. 57–8 respectively.

⁷² See Patrick J. Geary, *Furta Sacra: Thefts of Relics in the Central Middle Ages* (Princeton, 1978), pp. 5–6.

material or artefacts in the E text, even when it shares material with Hugh's narrative. The First Continuation in the vernacular *Chronicle*, for example, notes the acquisition of the headless body of St Florentin, but makes no mention of its importance as a popular relic for the abbey. Hugh, on the other hand, does not just detail the acquisition of this relic, but specifically mentions that it proved to be very popular, as people came from far and wide to the abbey to witness it.

The only mention in the *Peterborough Chronicle* of a saint's cult in action is the account of the death of St William of Norwich, one of the first instances of ritual murder accusations brought against the Jews. But in comparison to the later ramifications of the legend, the details given by the E text are quite sparse.⁷³ St William was not a Peterborough saint; his cult was based in Norwich, though it was popular all over East Anglia. Details of the legend and associated miracle stories are found in an account written by Thomas of Monmouth around the mid 1170s.⁷⁴ Though the body of William was discovered in 1144, ten years later, around 1154, it was taken from the chapter house of Norwich cathedral priory and translated to a chapel formerly known as the Chapel of the Holy Martyrs, and Jesus Chapel in due course. The cult of this local saint began to spread particularly rapidly after the 1150s, when miracles and visions at the site became frequent.⁷⁵

⁷³ See C. Roth, 'The Feast of Purim and the Origins of the Blood Accusation', *Speculum* 8 (1933), 520–6. Roth however notes on p. 523 that in this particular episode 'many elements of the later Blood Accusation are missing. The connection with the Passover is only accidental.'

⁷⁴ The text and translation of Thomas of Monmouth's narrative are found in A. Jessop and M. R. James, ed., *The Life and Miracles of St. William of Norwich by Thomas of Monmouth* (Cambridge, 1896). The editors note on p. liii that Thomas wrote his account based on hearsay, probably around 1172–3, as the book is dedicated to Bishop Turbe, who died in 1174. The manuscript date is 'somewhat before 1200' (p. li). The legend is as follows: William was the son of Wenstan and Elviva and seemed to show from a very early age signs of his future sanctity. At the age of eight, he was apprenticed to a skinner who traded with the Jews. The Jews sent a messenger who purported to be the cook of the archdeacon of Norwich, to lure William with a job. The mother was at first unwilling, but a sum of money clinched the deal. Then they called on William's aunt Liviva and told her of the arrangement. She was suspicious, and asked her daughter to follow them, and they were seen going into a Jew's house, and the boy was never seen alive again. William was apparently killed in an imitation of the Crucifixion, and his body dumped in the wood. On Good Friday evening, a strange light was seen pointing to a spot in Thorpe Wood and the body was discovered, uncorrupted and giving off the 'odour of sanctity', and buried in the monks' cemetery. Subsequently St William's miracles grew more and more apparent and numerous, and in 1154 his body was removed to the Chapter House and then to Jesus Chapel.

⁷⁵ Internal monastic politics seem to have played a part in the dissemination of this saint's cult. Thomas notes in his narrative that while Elias was prior at Norwich, there was a camp in the monastery which discredited the story of William's martyrdom. It was only after Elias died and Richard de Ferrariis became prior that the cult of the saint began to spread rapidly. As Jessop notes in the Introduction to his edition (p. xii): 'The general acceptance of the story of the martyrdom and the recognition of St. William as a real saint undoubtedly date from the time of his removal into the Cathedral. After this the

The story of William of Norwich (though not of direct relevance to Peterborough abbey) shows the importance of local saints' cults in the twelfth century, particularly around the time that the tail end of the E text was being written. This may reflect the contemporary importance of hagiographic material and the relics associated with them, as there is evidence indicating the popularity of local saints' cults, particularly during the period of the Anarchy, and some (like the story of the sanctification of William of Norwich mentioned by the Peterborough Continuator) do bear witness to the events of that turbulent time.⁷⁶ However, by its solitary presence, the brief story of William of Norwich points to the absence of the hagiographical element from the vernacular *Chronicle*, and the text's inability to emphasise the importance of such material. For example, though this text makes extensive mention of the Anglo-Saxon royal grants, and the personages associated with them, it fails to emphasise, through narrative, their importance as sanctified individuals who could (potentially) glorify the abbey through their association. Hugh's narrative, on the other hand, points to the importance of saints' relics for a monastic house, and the need to contextualise them through narrative.⁷⁷ This motivation is also evident in the near contemporary *Liber Eliensis*, which devotes a significant amount of narrative to the miracles of St Etheldreda (or Audrey), the patron saint of Ely. It promotes her cult by narrating the miracles that she worked, and eliminates criticism by narrating the misfortunes that befell cynics and doubters.⁷⁸ For Ely, St Etheldreda is not just a link with the Anglo-Saxon royal past which hints at Ely's ancient existence, she is also a constant source of income for the house, and therefore an important subject of historiography. Posterity tells us that none of Peterborough's saints ever quite attained the popularity of Ely's royal patron, but Hugh makes a valiant effort to reclaim Peterborough's royal patrons as important saints for the abbey. He notes in detail the translation of Saints Cyneburh and Cyneswith, sisters of Wulfhere, the founder-patron of the abbey, from the ruined church at Castor to Peterborough, following the entreaty by a faithful follower (based,

Norfolk gentry began to vie with each other in offering homage at the new shrine, and all classes followed their lead ... quite a furore existed at the end of King Stephen's reign in favour of the boy saint. Norfolk by this time proudly claimed him as their own. The cult was firmly established in East Anglia before the 12th century closed.'

⁷⁶ See Hugh M. Thomas, 'Miracle Stories and the Violence of King Stephen's Reign', *Haskins Society Journal* 13 (1999), pp. 111–24.

⁷⁷ However, it should be noted that Hugh makes the choice not to mention the contemporary story of William of Norwich, while the *Liber Eliensis*, on the other hand, concludes with the contemporary event of the martyrdom of Becket.

⁷⁸ Such miracles attributed to the saint are recorded in all three books of the *Liber Eliensis*, see Blake, *Liber Eliensis*, and Fairweather, trans., *Liber Eliensis*. Also see Blake, *Liber Eliensis*, pp. xxxii–xxxiii.

of course, at the location where the saint is finally translated).⁷⁹ The popularity and importance of these local saints is reinforced in the narrative by the significant competition from the monks of Ramsey, who (Hugh narrates) plotted to carry the bodies of these 'Peterborough' saints away and install them at their own abbey.⁸⁰ However, with all the predictability of hagiographic narrative, the saints respond to the call of the faithful at Peterborough and are finally installed there. Likewise, the body of St Tibba, a friend and relative of Wulfhere and his family is also installed at Peterborough from Ryhall. Annal 963 E, on the other hand, though making reference to this incident, merely narrates that the bodies of Cyneburh, Cyneswith and Tibba were brought to Peterborough during the abbacy of Ælfsige, and possibly consecrated or installed on the same day. The importance of affirming the presence and efficacy of relics is undoubtedly one of the most important aspects of Hugh's narrative, and this is further supported by his list of the location of other saints and their resting places, providing almost a short guide map for the faithful pilgrim. At this point, Hugh draws on the Kentish Royal Legend for his guide, thus indicating that he accessed a far wider body of specifically hagiographical sources than did his predecessors in historiography.⁸¹

It is significant that Hugh's narrative does not claim to be the fullest account of the translation of these saints. He specifically refers to 'the account of the translation of those saints to Burch, whereof it would be tedious to speak of in detail', thus indicating that these important relics associated with the abbey did have the contextual support of extended hagiographical narrative, now lost to posterity.⁸² Once again, Hugh's text, though incorporating hagiographic elements, remains conscious of the limitations of its genre, thus showing a sustained awareness of form and format.

In Hugh's text we can see an attempt to combine historiography, hagiography and legal (or semi-legal) documentation into a hybrid form that once again, like the historiography that preceded it, reflects the contemporary interests of the abbey. On the one hand, this Peterborough narrative (like the *Liber Eliensis* at nearby Ely) indicates that the interest in saints' cults, reliquaries and resting places is part of a much broader trend in the latter half of the twelfth century.

⁷⁹ Saints had a will of their own when it came to choosing their resting places, see Geary, *Furta Sacra*, pp. 132–3.

⁸⁰ Mellows, ed., *Hugh Candidus*, p. 50, and Mellows, trans., *Peterborough Chronicle*, p. 27.

⁸¹ See above p. 159.

⁸² 'sicut in translatione illarum plenissime inuenitur, quod longum est [e] narrare per singula'. See Mellows, ed., *Hugh Candidus*, p. 51 and Mellows, trans., *Peterborough Chronicle*, p. 28, respectively. It is tempting to speculate that this could also explain the absence of hagiographic material from the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, as a parallel text would either have existed or would have been in the pipeline.

However, it also implies that though documentation, grants and charters form an important and essential part of the abbey's image, these may not always be enough by themselves. Hugh's text indicates that the possessions of the abbey in terms of land and material wealth had to be supplemented by the spiritual (and material) wealth represented by saints' relics and shrines. Along with documents regarding land and property, these relics provided concrete links with a glorious Anglo-Saxon past.⁸³ While the local saints were a physical and spiritual reminder of the patrons who endowed the abbey over time, all of them potentially provided a continuous source of income by attracting pilgrims and visitors, who came to the place in hope of a miracle, and were effective tools of competition between the neighbouring monasteries, each selling their own brand of saint as the worker of many miracles. The land grants and charters provide a sense of a *locus* that can be physically mapped and identified through familiar bounds and markers over a period of time. In the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, they created a geographical space that inextricably linked the text to the abbey. The narrative of saints and their relics gives the sense of a spiritual *locus* that is as ancient and privileged, but also locates Hugh's text within a more contemporary context.

It is this which really brings us back to the actual dynamics of the text's existence, and the reason why Hugh's house-history was important for the abbey despite a formidable body of preceding historiography in Latin and vernacular, including at least the *Relatio*, the *Liber Niger* and the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. The answer lies in the inclusion of hagiographic material in *Hugh Candidus* which was totally absent from its vernacular predecessor. In retrospect, and from the perspective of the preceding analysis, it is possible to see this as commensurate with the *Chronicle's* overall focus on the form and function of its narrative. Just as it was not deemed to be a cartulary with respect to the inclusion of charters and land grants, it was parsimonious with regard to the inclusion of hagiographic material, which remained beyond the scope of its form and function. The annal form of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* was flexible enough to incorporate foundation charters and subsequent grants as speech acts, but would be hard pressed to include more hagiographic material like detailed descriptions of relics and miracles. Even the rise of William of Norwich's cult is noted by the Second Continuator as something that happened as a contemporary event during the reign of Stephen, rather than an account of the saint's translation and installation. It is also possible that this exclusion of hagiographic material by the

⁸³ Significantly, Cyneburh and Cyneswith appear as witnesses to Wulfhere's charter, the most ideologically effective document that the abbey produced to validate its glorious past. Also see Rollason, *Saints and Relics*, pp. 196–214, particularly, pp. 202–3.

Second Continuator was due to an inherited narrative stance. The First Compiler of the *Peterborough Chronicle* paid more attention to the story of the abbey's origins than to the proliferation of local saints cults, and his careful retention of the form and structure of the proto-E text is apparent in the construction of his text. So while the acquisition of relics or the translations of saints' bodies may be noted as part of the actions of a particular abbot (Abbot Ælfsige, for example), it is not elaborated upon. Attention has already been drawn to the careful imitation (from a scribal and textual point of view) of the earlier phases of the Peterborough text in its last phase twenty years on,⁸⁴ and it is possible that the compilatory stance was imitated as well.⁸⁵ Yet the mention of the cult of William of Norwich, however sparse, indicates that local saints' relics and the miracles associated with them were becoming increasingly important in the twelfth century. But the sustained focus of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* on the abbey's origins and history, and its ability to survive depredations, ensures that the hagiographic element is unable to inhabit a space within the text.

Hugh's text, on the other hand, has a more flexible approach to its construction. The narrative is structured according to themes which overlap fairly easily, if we judge from the extant transcript and versions present in the later cartularies of Swaffham and Whittlesey. The narrative of Peterborough moves effortlessly between the actions of Peterborough abbots and the acquisition or alienation of relics and land. These overlapping themes and sections allow for the incorporation of external documentation (which includes not just the origin charters but also later documentation like the two bulls of Pope Eugenius III) as well as narrative digression (for example, the foundation and subsequent destruction of the abbey seamlessly leads to the narrative of its refoundation by Æthelwold, which gives Hugh the chance not only to insert a list of early Peterborough abbots, but also to narrate the story of Adulf the chancellor). It is a pattern that is repeated right from the story of the origins of *Medeshamstede* up to the deposition of William of Waterville. However, in addition to this fluid narrative structure, it is Hugh's easy focus on the miraculous and divine in the history of the abbey, and his conscious desire to list the abbey's possessions, material and spiritual, that make it far easier for him to include a wealth of information on Peterborough's saints, their shrines, and the relics held by their abbey. Hugh also lists these objects by location within the precincts (relics stored in the high altar,

⁸⁴ This involves the appearance of the scribal hand (see Chapter 2, pp. 82–3, and Chapter 3, pp. 105–10) and the continued use of the annal format (though not as perfectly maintained), as well the superficial use of similar narrative devices and linguistic registers (see Chapter 2, pp. 91–9).

⁸⁵ This is also not unusual given the possible importation of a compilatory stance from an earlier phase of the proto-E text at Canterbury, see Chapter 3, pp. 111–20.

or in the silver tower), thus providing comprehensive information for those who wished to access these objects. Though nowhere as detailed as the *Liber Eliensis* in its account of miracles associated with a particular saint, or the harm caused to sceptics, Hugh's text takes the truth of their validity for granted by his authorial involvement in their presence. He himself claims to have seen the uncorrupted arm of St Oswald, and bears witness to the event that, when the relic was opened during the abbacy of Matthew Ridel (who doubted its sanctity), blood gushed out from the shoulder blade when the sacrist Eilric tried to handle it.⁸⁶ By his direct involvement as author, and without any obvious evidence of self-interest involved,⁸⁷ he provides a powerful documentary validation of the power of Peterborough's saints and relics, rather than just a narrative of miracles.

Peterborough produced *Hugh Candidus* not because the language of the earlier *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* was no longer valid, but because it was deemed necessary in order to articulate the changing concerns of the abbey. Increasingly, in the twelfth century, the abbey would have needed to focus not just on its material wealth and land acquisitions (which remain abiding concerns at all times), but also issues like the validity and popularity of its relic base, which would count as material and spiritual possessions. While the importance of relics is a matter of relevance for all Fenland house histories, and the tradition of local hagiography is well established by the time Hugh writes his Latin house-history, it is possible to speculate that this was a concern that was being urgently felt at Peterborough in the latter part of the twelfth century because the abbey may have needed the extra income in the aftermath of the Anarchy and Abbot Martin's building programmes.

While the relics possessed by the abbey would undoubtedly bring it practical and monetary benefits, it is also important to note that their function goes much deeper than this. As physical embodiments of the saints they represent, they are a part of the abbey's spiritual identity, and augment and complement the abbey's self-portrayal as an ancient Petrine house, endowed by Anglo-Saxon royalty, and consistently maintaining a monastic identity even during times of chaos. Like the charters incorporated in the narrative, the hagiographic element in *Hugh Candidus* is a hybrid element that implies and cross-references

⁸⁶ Mellows, ed., *Hugh Candidus*, p. 83 and Mellows, trans., *Peterborough Chronicle*, p. 44.

⁸⁷ Thomas of Monmouth, the chronicler of William of Norwich's story, was active in promoting his cult, even when facing scepticism from the prior, Elias, see above, pp. 162–163. For an analysis of the incident from the perspective of ritual murder, see John M. McCulloh, 'Jewish Ritual Murder: William of Norwich, Thomas of Monmouth, and the Early Dissemination of the Myth', *Speculum* 72 (1997), 698–740, and Gavin I. Langmuir, 'Thomas of Monmouth: Detector of Ritual Murder', *Speculum* 59 (1984), 820–46. For a detailed account of the politics involved in William's sanctification and translation, see M. D. Anderson, *A Saint at Stake: The Strange Death of William of Norwich 1144* (London, 1964), particularly pp. 198–202.

(but does not replace) an external corpus of texts.⁸⁸ While the bounds of the charters incorporated in both vernacular and Latin historiography created a geographical space that was both real and symbolic, this narrative of saints and their relics in *Hugh Candidus* simultaneously locates the abbey in a spiritual space that is both historical and contemporary, creating a sense of identity that is timeless.

Afterlives and critical implications

Hugh Candidus becomes the definitive narrative of the abbey in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. It is copied and modified in the later cartularies of the abbey and continues to be a source for later antiquarian studies. The narrative of the *Peterborough Chronicle*, on the other hand, remains fixed in time, though the manuscript itself shows signs of re-use when an Anglo-Norman *Brut* is copied along its margins.⁸⁹ The specific reasons as to why the vernacular manuscript may have been considered appropriate for this Anglo-Norman text, or the textual implications of the Anglo-Norman text being written as marginalia, remain beyond the scope of this study. As it stands, the manuscript aptly becomes a symbol of co-existence, with a text in the old vernacular sharing space with a text in a new vernacular.

However, despite the ascendancy of *Hugh Candidus*, and the ultimate reuse of the vernacular *Chronicle* manuscript, the importance of this version of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* for Peterborough abbey, and (in retrospect) for our critical perception of medieval texts, cannot be overestimated. It is a significant text in the corpus of historiography written at the abbey in the first half of the twelfth century, drawing on a range of parallel and contemporary texts in Latin like the *Relatio Heddae* and the *Liber Niger*. The compilation of the vernacular *Chronicle* in all its phases shows a deep awareness of the form and structure of the received proto-E text, and a nuanced integration of the old and new portions of the text. The scribal and compilatory phases match exactly, thus indicating concerted collaboration between all three phases of the text, and (in the case of the first two phases of the text) evidence of a single author being responsible for the writing and compilation of the manuscript. The neat appearance of the manuscript manifestly indicates that this was a text that was intended for publication and display, in marked contrast to the untidiness of the near contemporary F text of the *Chronicle* at Canterbury, which provides an intimate view of the changing editorial intentions of its compiler. Yet the construc-

⁸⁸ See above, pp. 163–4 for the lost text regarding the translation of saints Cyneburh, Cyneswith and Tibba.

⁸⁹ See Whitelock, *Peterborough Chronicle*, pp. 172–80.

tion of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* at Canterbury plays a seminal role in the subsequent construction of the vernacular *Chronicle* at Peterborough, for not only does the former stage determine the contents of the version obtained by the abbey (the proto-E text), but it also indicates the importation of an entire compilatory and editorial stance, whereby the proto-E version is accorded a status higher than the other earlier versions of the *Chronicle*. There could be a range of reasons for this; it was certainly the most available post-Conquest version, or, as part of the Northern Recension and associated with Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*, a particularly good representative of an earlier historiographical tradition. However, this attitude is the logical reason for the retention of all the previous features of the text at Peterborough, and a careful integration of the new portions of the text. This is particularly apparent in the Interpolations, where Peterborough origin history is integrated into the pre-existent Common Stock portion of the text, and in the use of *topoi* and linguistic registers to act as connective tissue linking the proto-E with the First Continuation.

Beyond Peterborough, the status of this particular vernacular text meant that it was a widely used source for a wide corpus of Latin historiography in the twelfth century, including texts by historians like John of Worcester, William of Malmesbury and Henry of Huntingdon, as well as by anonymous compilers, like that of the WA. The close connections of the vernacular *Chronicle* with Latin historiography in the twelfth century further indicates that historiography in both Latin and vernacular possibly drew on a body of common source material which was then modified according to individual needs and ideologies. This is apparent for the post-Conquest period, and particularly so for the narratives of the Anarchy, which seem to share a generic account of tortures, perhaps made specific in parts by reference to location and particular events. This suggestion of common source material drawn on by both Latin and vernacular historians in a contemporary setting also qualifies a simplistic picture of historiography in the vernacular giving way to historiography in Latin only because of the relative status of the language in which they were written. Indeed, the care involved in the production of the *Peterborough Chronicle*, when combined with its interactions with alternative forms of historiography at the centre, and the incorporation of hybrid elements within the fabric of the text, strongly argues that the rationale for historiography was a coherent idea of the form and function of the text, rather than the language in which it was written.⁹⁰ As part of a glorious tradition of vernacular historiography (whose Common Stock portion could be traced back to the Alfredian royal court and,

⁹⁰ This is also applicable for the shift in focus from the vernacular *Chronicle* to the *Chronicle of Hugh Candidus* at Peterborough itself, as analysed above, pp. 152–68.

by implication, the king's larger programme of education and reform), the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* was undoubtedly the most suitable vehicle to communicate an ideologically motivated narrative of the glorious past of Peterborough abbey. In the text it is a place endowed with wealth and granted unprecedented freedom by Anglo-Saxon royalty, and established as a grand Petrine house that stood the test of time, through the Viking raids, the turbulent period following the Norman Conquest, and the Anarchy of King Stephen's reign. The retention of the earlier format of the *Chronicle* in its continuation in the second half of the twelfth century also indicates its importance as a valid form of vernacular historiography, and the scribal links of this phase of the E text with the construction of the twelfth-century portion of the *Liber Niger* also indicates that it was an integral component of a much larger programme of text production that Peterborough abbey undertook in the twelfth century.

The Latin *Hugh Candidus*, which follows the writing of the *Peterborough Chronicle*, also drew on the work of its predecessor, as well as a body of composite documentation of grants and charters accessed by the first compiler of the vernacular *Chronicle*. However, as the preceding analysis indicates, while some concerns remain common to both texts (for example, the focus on the early history of the abbey or on charters and land grants pertaining to the place), newer concerns start to dominate in the latter half of the twelfth century. It becomes more and more important to focus on the relic base of the abbey, which not only endows it with spiritual identity, but would also have been a substantial source of income. The preceding analysis suggests that the need to have narrative validating local saints and relics played a significant part in the dynamics of text production at Peterborough in the latter half of the twelfth century, and the narrative of Peterborough relics in *Hugh Candidus* is all that remains of a wider body of narrative dealing with local hagiography, now unfortunately lost.

The primary reference point of this study has been the writing of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* at Peterborough in the twelfth century. This writing of a single version of the *Chronicle* in the 1120s, following the traditional annal format, has been considered an anomaly in previous *Chronicle* scholarship.⁹¹ However, this study has shown that a detailed analysis of the process of re-writing and compiling the *Chronicle* at Peterborough, and its interactions with a range of associated texts, both at Peterborough and beyond, can provide a coherent picture of the complex textual culture at the abbey. Even though we are hampered by the paucity of records and texts from the Peterborough scriptorium, the presence of alternative genres and historiographical

⁹¹ See Introduction, pp. 1–16.

forms in addition to the vernacular *Chronicle* (charters, the *Liber Niger* and *Hugh Candidus*) can shed significant light on the production and use of vernacular historiography as represented by the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*.⁹² Furthermore, this perspective can also inform the broader picture of historiography in the twelfth century, as the adaptation and use of the *Chronicle* at Peterborough, and its prior stage of transmission at Canterbury, demonstrates the importance and validity of the tradition of vernacular historiography in the post-Conquest period. While the starting point of this study was the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, it has involved a re-evaluation of the dynamics between Latin and vernacular historiography in the twelfth century, both at a local level and beyond. It indicates a post-Conquest textual culture (in both vernacular and Latin) that was vibrant and symbiotic, as well as fluid and flexible in terms of form and genre. While on the one hand, the writing of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* at Peterborough is testament to the longevity of the vernacular tradition, through its modifications and generic changes it also interacts with alternative forms of historiography, thus placing it at the forefront of the development of hybrid historiographical forms. It remains, in the final analysis, not just a representative of an earlier tradition of annalistic historiography, but a bridge between the old and new worlds of historiography in the twelfth century, and a testament to the fluidity, adaptability and resilience of this form.

⁹² The Preface by Simon Patrick, dean of Peterborough, to Simon Gunton's magisterial history of the abbey written in the seventeenth century, laments the destruction of texts 'being torn in pieces, or burnt, by ... those ignorant people; who took upon them the glorious name of Reformers'; more may have been lost earlier during the Dissolution, and certainly later in the Cottonian fire in 1731.

Bibliography

- Anderson, M. D., *A Saint at Stake: The Strange Death of William of Norwich 1144* (London, 1964)
- Arnold, T., ed., *Symeon of Durham: Historical Works*, RS 75, 2 vols. (London, 1882–85)
- Baker, P. S., ed., *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* 8. MS F (Cambridge, 2000)
- Barney, Stephen A., *The Etymologies of Isidore of Seville* (Cambridge, 2006)
- Bately, Janet, 'Compilation of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle once more', *Leeds Studies in English*, ns 16 (1985), 7–26
- Bately, Janet M., ed., *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* 3. MS A (Cambridge, 1986)
- Bately, Janet, *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: Texts and Textual Relationships*, Reading Medieval Studies Monograph 3 (Reading, 1991)
- Bethurum, Dorothy, ed., *The Homilies of Wulfstan* (Oxford, 1957)
- Birch, W. de G., ed., *Cartularium Saxonicum*, 3 vols (London, 1885–93)
- Bishop, T. A. M., 'Notes on Cambridge Manuscripts, Part I', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 1 (1949–53), 432–41
- Blake, E. O., ed., *Liber Eliensis*, Camden Third Series 79 (London, 1962)
- Bosworth, J., and T. N. Toller, eds, *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* (London, 1973)
- Bredehoft, T. A., *Textual Histories: Readings in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (Toronto, 2001)
- Bremmer, Rolf, 'The Germanic Context of "Cynewulf and Cyneheard" Revisited', *Neophilologus* 81 (1997), 445–65
- Brett, M., 'John of Worcester and His Contemporaries', *The Writing of History in the Middle Ages. Essays presented to Richard William Southern*, ed. R. H. C. Davis et al. (Oxford, 1981), pp. 101–26
- Brooks, Nicholas, *The Early History of the Church of Canterbury: Christ Church from 597 to 1066* (Leicester, 1984)
- Brooks, Nicholas, 'Why Is the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle about Kings?', *ASE* 39 (2010), 43–70
- Caie, Graham D., 'The Manuscript Experience: What Medieval Vernacular Manuscripts Tell Us about Authors and Texts', *Medieval Texts in Context*, ed. Denis Renevey and Graham D. Caie (London and New York, 2008), pp. 10–27
- Campbell, J., 'Some Twelfth-Century Views of the Anglo-Saxon Past', in *Essays in Anglo-Saxon History* (London, 1986), pp. 209–28

- Carroll, Jayne, 'Poetic Discourse in Viking Age England: Texts and Contexts' (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Nottingham University, 2001)
- Carruthers, Mary, *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture* (Cambridge, 1990)
- Cerquignani, Bernard, *Éloge de la variante: Histoire critique de la philologie* (Paris, 1989)
- Chibnall, Marjorie, ed., *The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis*, 5 vols, OMT (Oxford, 1969–73)
- Clark, Cecily, ed., *The Peterborough Chronicle 1070–1154*, 2nd edn (Oxford, 1970)
- Clark, Cecily, 'This Ecclesiastical Adventurer: Henry of Saint Jean d'Angély', *EHR* 84 (1969), 548–60
- Clark, Cecily, 'Notes on MS. Laud Misc. 636', *Medium Aevum* 23 (1954), 71–5
- Clemoes, Peter, *The Cult of St Oswald on the Continent*, Jarrow Lecture 1983 (Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 1984)
- Conner, Patrick W., ed., *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle 10. The Abingdon Chronicle, A.D. 956–1066* (Cambridge, 1996)
- Coser, Lewis A., ed., *Maurice Halbwachs: On Collective Memory* (Chicago, 1992)
- Coulson, Charles, 'The Castles of the Anarchy', *The Anarchy of King Stephen's Reign*, ed. E. King (Oxford, 1994), pp. 67–92
- Cubbin, G. P., ed., *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle 6. MS D* (Cambridge, 1996)
- Da Rold, Orietta, Takako Kato, Mary Swan and Elaine Treharne, eds, *The Production and Use of English Manuscripts 1060 to 1220* (University of Leicester 2010), available at <http://www.le.ac.uk/ee/em1060to1220>
- Darlington, R. R. and P. McGurk, eds, *The Chronicle of John of Worcester Vol II: The Annals from 450 to 1066* (Oxford, 1995)
- Davis, R. H. C., *King Stephen 1135–1154* (London, 1967)
- Duff, David, ed., *Modern Genre Theory* (Harlow, 2000)
- Dumville, David, ed., *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle 1. MS. F, Facsimile Edition* (Cambridge, 1995)
- Dumville, D. N., 'Some Aspects of Annalistic Writing at Canterbury in the Eleventh and Early Twelfth Centuries', *Peritia* 2 (1983), 23–57
- Dumville, D. N., 'A Bilingual English/Latin Chronicle Written around AD 1100', *Fedorov Readings* (2000).
- Fairweather, Janet, trans., *Liber Eliensis: A History of the Isle of Ely from the Seventh Century to the Twelfth, compiled by a Monk of Ely in the Twelfth century* (Woodbridge, 2005)
- Fantham, Elaine, 'The Growth of Literature and Criticism in Rome', *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism, I. Classical Criticism*, ed. George A. Kennedy (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 220–44

Bibliography

- Fantham, Elaine, 'Latin Criticism of the Early Empire', in *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism 1. Classical Criticism*, ed., George A. Kennedy (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 274–96
- Fleming, Robin, 'Christ Church Canterbury's Anglo-Norman Cartulary', *Anglo-Norman Political Culture and the Twelfth-Century Renaissance: Proceedings of the Borchard Conference on Anglo-Norman History, 1995*, ed. C. W. Hollister (Woodbridge, 1997), pp. 83–155
- Foot, Sarah, 'Plenty, Portents and Plague: Ecclesiastical Readings of the Natural World in Early Medieval Europe', *God's Bounty? The Churches and the Natural World*, ed. Peter Clarke and Tony Claydon (Woodbridge, 2010), pp. 15–41
- Fowler, Alastair, *Kinds of Literature* (Cambridge, MA, 1982)
- Friis-Jensen, Karsten, and James M. W. Willoughby, eds, *Peterborough Abbey*, *Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues* 8 (London, 2001)
- Galbraith, V. H., 'Monastic Foundation Charters of the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries', *The Cambridge Historical Journal* 4 (1934), 205–22
- Garmonsway, G. N., *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (London and New York, 1953)
- Geary, Patrick J., *Phantoms of Remembrance: Memory and Oblivion at the End of the Millenium* (Princeton, 1994)
- Geary, Patrick J., *Furta Sacra: Thefts of Relics in the Central Middle Ages* (Princeton, 1978)
- Gillespie, Vincent, 'From the Twelfth Century to c. 1450', *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism 2. The Middle Ages*, ed. Alastair Minnis and Ian Johnson (Cambridge, 2005), pp. 145–235
- Greenway, Diana, ed., *Henry of Huntingdon: Historia Anglorum*, OMT (Oxford, 1996)
- Gransden, Antonia, 'Traditionalism and Continuity during the Last Century of Anglo-Saxon Monasticism', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 40 (1989), 159–207
- Gransden, A., *Historical Writing in England c. 550 to c. 1307* (London, 1974)
- Gunton, Simon, *A history of the church of Peterborough wherein the most remarkable things concerning that place, from the first foundation thereof, with other passages of history not unworthy publick view, are represented*, *Early English Books 1641–1700* (London, 1686)
- Halliwel, Stephen, 'Aristotle's Poetics', *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism 1. Classical Criticism*, ed. George A. Kennedy (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 149–83
- Hart, C., 'Hereward the Wake and His Companions', in *The Danelaw* (London and Rio Grande, 1992), pp. 625–48
- Hickes, G., *Linguarum vet. septentrionalium thesaurus grammatico-criticus et archæologicus*, 2 vols (Oxford, 1705)

- Hollister, C. W., 'The Aristocracy', *The Anarchy of King Stephen's Reign*, ed. E. King (Oxford, 1994), pp. 37–66
- Home, Malasree, 'The Peterborough Chronicle and the Writing of History in the Twelfth century' (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Cambridge, 2005)
- Home, Malasree, "'These things we have written about him": the Portrait of King William in "The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle" 1086E', *Anglo-Saxon* 1 (2007), 239–68
- Home, Malasree, 'Double-edged déjà vu: the Complexity of the Peterborough Chronicle', *Reading the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, Studies in the Early Middle Ages 23, ed. Alice Jorgensen (Turnhout, 2010), pp. 67–90
- Howe, Nicolas, *Writing the Map of Anglo-Saxon England: Essays in Cultural Geography* (New Haven and London, 2008)
- Innes, Doreen C., 'Augustan Critics', *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism* 1. *Classical Criticism*, ed. George A. Kennedy (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 245–73
- Irvine, Martine and David Thomson, 'Grammatica and Literary Theory' *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism* 2. *The Middle Ages*, ed. Alastair Minnis and Ian Johnson (Cambridge, 2005), pp. 15–41
- Irvine, Susan, ed., *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* 7, MS E (Cambridge, 2004)
- Irvine, Susan, 'The Production of The Peterborough Chronicle', *Reading the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, Studies in the Early Middle Ages 23, ed. Alice Jorgensen (Turnhout, 2010), pp. 49–66
- Jacobs, Nicolas, 'Kindly Light or Foxfire? The Authorial Text Reconsidered', *A Guide to Editing Middle English*, ed. Vincent P. McCarren and Douglas Moffat (Ann Arbor, 1998), pp. 3–14
- James, M. R., 'Lists of Manuscripts Formerly in Peterborough Abbey Library', *Supplement to the Transactions of the Bibliographical Society* 5 (London, 1926)
- Jessop, A., and M. R. James, eds, *The Life and Miracles of St. William of Norwich by Thomas of Monmouth* (Cambridge, 1896)
- Jorgensen, Alice, ed., *Reading the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, Studies in the Early Middle Ages 23 (Turnhout, 2010)
- Jorgensen, Alice, 'Introduction' in *Reading the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, Studies in the Early Middle Ages 23, ed. A Jorgensen (Turnhout, 2010), pp. 1–28
- Jorgensen, Alice, 'Rewriting the Æthelredian Chronicle: Narrative Style and Identity in Anglo-Saxon Chronicle MS F', *Reading the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, Studies in the Early Middle Ages 23, ed. Alice Jorgensen (Turnhout, 2010), pp. 113–38
- Jorgensen, Alice, 'Scott T. Smith. *Land and Book: Literature and Land Tenure in Anglo-Saxon England*', *RES* 65 (2014), 342–3
- Kelly, S. E. ed., *Charters of Peterborough Abbey* (Oxford, 2009)

Bibliography

- Kelly, S. E. ed., *Charters of St. Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury and Minster-in-Thanel*, Anglo-Saxon Charters 4 (Oxford, 1995)
- Kennedy, George A., ed., *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism 1. Classical Criticism* (Cambridge, 1989)
- Kemble, J. M., *Codex Diplomaticus Aevi Saxonici*, 6 vols (London, 1839–48)
- Ker, N. R., *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon* (Oxford, 1957; reprinted with supplement, 1990)
- Keynes, Simon, *The Councils of Clofesho*, Vaughan Paper 38 (Leicester, 1994)
- Keynes, Simon, 'The Declining Reputation of King Æthelred the Unready', *Ethelred the Unready: Papers from the Millenary Conference*, ed. D. Hill (Oxford, 1978), pp. 227–53
- King, E., and K. R. Potter, eds, *William of Malmesbury, Historia Novella*, OMT (Oxford, 1998)
- King, E., ed., *The Anarchy of King Stephen's Reign* (Oxford, 1994)
- King, Edmund, *Peterborough Abbey 1086–1310: A Study in the Land Market* (Cambridge, 1973)
- King, J. E., ed., *Bedæ Opera Historica*, 2 vols (London, 1930)
- Knowles, David, 'Essays in Monastic History IV – The Growth of Exemption', *Downside Review*, ns, 31(1932), 201–31 and 396–436
- Knowles, David, 'Essays in Monastic History III – The Norman Monasticism', *Downside Review*, ns, 31 (1932), 33–48
- Langmuir, Gavin I., 'Thomas of Monmouth: Detector of Ritual Murder', *Speculum* 59 (1984), 820–46
- Lanham, R. A., *A Handlist of Rhetorical Terms* (Berkeley, 1969)
- Levison, W., *England and the Continent* (Oxford, 1966)
- Liebermann, Felix, *Ungedruckte Anglonormannische Geschichtsquellen* (Strasbourg, 1879)
- Liebermann, Felix, ed., *Die Heiligen Englands* (Hanover, 1889)
- Logeman, H., ed., *The Rule of St Benet*, EETS OS 90 (London, repr. 1973)
- Luard, Henry Richards, ed., *Annales Monastici* II, RS 36 (London, 1865)
- Liuzza, R. M., 'Anglo-Saxon Prognostics in Context: a Survey and Handlist of Manuscripts', *ASE* 30 (2001), 181–230
- Machan, Tim William, *Textual Criticism and Middle English Texts* (Charlottesville and London, 1994)
- Macray, W. D., ed., *Chronicon Abbatiae Ramesiensis*, RS 83 (London, 1886)
- Malone, Kemp, 'Herlekin and Herlewin', *Studies in Heroic Legend and in Current Speech*, ed. S. Einarsson and N. E. Eliason (Copenhagen, 1959), pp. 193–6
- Martin, Janet, *The Cartularies and Registers of Peterborough Abbey*, Northamptonshire Record Society (Peterborough, 1978)
- McCulloh, John M., 'Jewish Ritual Murder: William of Norwich,

Peterborough Version of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle

- Thomas of Monmouth, and the Early Dissemination of the Myth', *Speculum* 72 (1997), 698–740
- McGurk, P., ed., *The Chronicle of John of Worcester, Vol III: The Annals from 1067 to 1140 with the Gloucester Interpolations and the Continuations till 1141*, OMT (Oxford, 1998)
- McIntosh, A., 'Wulfstan's Prose', *British Academy Papers on Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. E. G. Stanley (Oxford, 1990), pp. 111–44
- Mellows, W. T., ed., *The Chronicle of Hugh Candidus, a Monk of Peterborough* (Oxford, 1949)
- Mellows, W. T. and Charles Mellows, trans., *The Peterborough Chronicle of Hugh Candidus* (Peterborough, 1980)
- Michelet, Fabienne L., *Creation, Migration, and Conquest: Imaginary Geography and Sense of Space in Old English Literature* (Oxford, 2006)
- Millett, Bella, 'Mouvance and the Medieval Author', *Late-Medieval Religious Texts and Their Transmission: Essays in Honour of A. I. Doyle*, ed. A. J. Minnis, York Manuscripts Conference 3 (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 9–20
- Minnis, A. J., *Medieval Theory of Authorship: Scholastic Literary Attitudes in the Later Middle Ages* (London, 1984)
- Minnis, Alastair and Ian Johnson, eds, *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism 2. The Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 2005)
- Mitchell, Bruce, 'Syntax and Word-Order in *The Peterborough Chronicle* 1122–1154', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 65 (1964), 113–44
- Mynors, R. A. B., R. M. Thomson and M. Winterbottom, eds., *William of Malmesbury: Gesta Regum Anglorum, Vol I* (Oxford, 1998)
- O'Brien O'Keefe, Katherine, ed., *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle 5. MS C* (Cambridge, 2001)
- Parkes, M. B., *Scribes, Scripts, and Readers: Studies in the Communication, Presentation, and Dissemination of Medieval Texts* (London, 1991)
- Parkes, M. B. and Andrew G Watson, eds, *Medieval Scribes, Manuscripts and Libraries: Essays presented to N. R. Ker* (London, 1978)
- Partner, Nancy, *Serious Entertainments: The Writing of History in Twelfth-Century England* (Chicago, 1977)
- Paxton, J. A., 'Charter and Chronicle in Twelfth-Century England: The House Histories of the Fenland Abbeys' (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1999)
- Paxton, Jennifer, 'Forging Communities: Memory and Identity in Post Conquest England', *Haskins Society Journal* 10 (2001), 95–109
- Paxton, Jennifer, 'Textual Communities in the English Fenlands: a Lay Audience for Monastic Chronicles?', *Anglo-Norman Studies 26: Proceedings of the Battle Conference 2003*, ed. John Gillingham (Woodbridge, 2004), pp. 123–37
- Plummer, C., ed., *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel*, 2 vols (Oxford, 1892–99)
- Potter, K. R., ed., *Gesta Stephani*, OMT (Oxford, 1976)

Bibliography

- Raban, Sandra, *The Estates of Thorney and Crowland* (Cambridge, 1977)
- Renevey, Denis, and Graham D. Caie, 'Introduction', *Medieval Texts in Context*, ed. Denis Renevey and Graham D. Caie (London and New York, 2008), pp. 1–9
- Renevey Denis and Graham D. Caie, eds, *Medieval Texts in Context* (London and New York, 2008)
- Rigg, A. G., *A History of Anglo-Latin Literature 1066–1422* (Cambridge, 1992)
- Rollason, David, ed., *Simeon of Durham: Tract on the Origins and Progress of this the Church of Durham*, OMT (Oxford, 2000)
- Rollason, D. W., 'Lists of Saints' Resting Places in Anglo-Saxon England', *ASE* 7 (1978), 61–93
- Rollason, D. W., *Saints and Relics in Anglo-Saxon England* (Oxford, 1989)
- Roth, C., 'The Feast of Purim and the Origins of the Blood Accusation', *Speculum* 8 (1933), 520–6
- Russell, Donald A., 'Greek Criticism of the Empire', *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism* 1. *Classical Criticism*, ed. George A. Kennedy (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 297–329
- Sawyer, P. H., ed., *Anglo-Saxon Charters: an Annotated List and Bibliography*, Royal Historical Society Guides and Handbooks 8 (London, 1968)
- Sawyer, P. H., *The Age of the Vikings*, 2nd edn (London, 1971)
- Searle, E., ed., *The Chronicle of Battle Abbey*, OMT (Oxford, 1980)
- Sheppard, Alice, *Families of the King: Writing Identity in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (Toronto, 2004)
- Smith, Scott T., *Land and Book: Literature and Land Tenure in Anglo-Saxon England* (Toronto, 2012)
- Southern, R. W., 'Aspects of the European Tradition of Historical Writing: 4, the Sense of the Past', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Series 5, 23 (1973), 243–63
- Stafford, Pauline, 'The Anglo-Saxon Chronicles, Identity and the Making of England', *Haskins Society Journal* 19 (2008), 28–50
- Stafford, Pauline, 'Reading the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: Language, Literature, History by Alice Jorgensen', *EHR* 127, no. 527 (2012), 954–6
- Stenton, F. M., 'Medeshamstede and Its Colonies', *Historical Essays in Honour of James Tait*, eds. J. G. Edwards, V. H. Galbraith and E. F. Jacob (Manchester, 1933), pp. 313–26
- Stevenson, W. H., 'Trinoda Necessitas', *EHR* 29 (1914), 689–703
- Stock, Brian, *The Implications of Literacy* (Princeton, 1983)
- Stodnick, Jaqueline, 'Second-Rate Stories? Changing Approaches to the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle', *Literature Compass* 3 (2006), 1253–65
- Swanton, M. J., *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicles*, revised edn (London 2000)
- Taylor, Simon, ed., *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* 4. *MS B* (Cambridge, 1983)

Peterborough Version of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle

- Thomas, Hugh M., 'Miracle Stories and the Violence of King Stephen's Reign', *Haskins Society Journal* 13 (1999), 111–24
- Thomson, R. M., 'The "scriptorium" of William of Malmesbury', *Medieval Scribes, Manuscripts and Libraries: Essays Presented to N.R. Ker*, ed. M. B. Parkes and Andrew G. Watson (London, 1978), pp. 117–42
- Thomson, R. M., *William of Malmesbury* (Woodbridge, 1987)
- Thomson, R. M., ed., *William of Malmesbury: Gesta Regum Anglorum*, Vol. II (Oxford, 1999)
- Thorpe, Benjamin, ed., *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, According to the Several Original Authorities*, 2 vols, RS 23 (London, 1861)
- Townend, M., 'Pre-Cnut Praise-Poetry in Viking Age England', *RES*, ns 51 (2000), 349–70
- Tynanov, Yury, 'The Literary Fact', *Modern Genre Theory*, ed. David Duff (Harlow, 2000), pp. 29–49
- van Houts, E. M. C., *Local and Regional Chronicles*, *Typologie des Sources du Moyen Âge Occidental* 74 (Turnhout, 1995)
- Wetherbee, Winthrop, 'From Late Antiquity to the Twelfth Century', *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism* 2. *The Middle Ages*, ed. Alastair Minnis and Ian Johnson (Cambridge, 2005), pp. 99–144
- White, Stephen D., 'Kinship and Lordship in Early Medieval England: The Story of Sigeberht, Cynewulf, and Cyneheard', *Viator* 20 (1989), 1–18
- Whitelock, Dorothy, ed., *The Peterborough Chronicle*, EEMF 4 (Copenhagen, 1954)
- Whitelock, Dorothy, D. C. Douglas and S. I. Tucker, eds, *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Revised Translation* (London, 1965)
- Whitelock, Dorothy, *English Historical Documents, c.500–1042* (London, 1979)
- Whitelock, Dorothy, 'The Prose of Alfred's Reign', *Continuations and Beginnings: Studies in Old English Literature*, ed. E. G. Stanley (London, 1966), pp. 67–103
- Williams, Ann, and G. H. Martin, eds, *Domesday Book* (London, 2002)
- Zumthor, Paul, *Essai de poétique médiévale*, Collection poétique (Paris, 1972)
- Zumthor, Paul, 'Intervocalité et mouvance', *La lettre et la voix: De la 'littérature' médiévale*, Collection poétique (Paris, 1987), pp. 160–8

Index

- Acta Lanfranci* 7, 11, 12, 16, 22, 45, 63
 Adolf, chancellor of King Edgar 151, 156, 166
 Ælfsige, abbot of Peterborough 24 n.13, 40, 50, 55, 69, 158, 159, 164, 166
 Æthelred, king of England 1, 50, 70
 Æthelred, brother of King Wulfhere, king of Mercia 23, 30–31 n.40, 33 n.48, 37, 41
 Æthelric, monk of Peterborough, formerly bishop of York and Durham 160
 Æthelwold, bishop of Winchester 22, 37, 38, 40, 45, 98, 107, 117, 150, 151, 166
 Æthelwold, prior of Peterborough 47, 158
 Agatho, pope
 Bull of 23 n.7, 36 40, 66, 111, 112, 113
 Alexander, bishop of Lincoln 68, 126, 129, 130, 160, 161
Annales de Waverleia
 see under Waverley Annals
Anglo-Saxon Chronicle
 Common Stock 1, 5, 7, 15, 29, 30, 32, 44 n.88, 102, 106, 119, 123, 132, 169, 170
 Lordship obligations in 8–9
 Northern Recension 1, 14, 114, 118, 119, 124, 126, 169
 Poetry in 6, 7, 9–11, 136
 Version A 4 n.15, 7, 11 n.35, 32 n.42, 111 n.30
 Version B 4 n.15, 12
 Version C 4 n.15, 12
 Version D 7, 13, 14, 15, 18, 43, 48, 49, 51, 118, 123
 Version E
 see under Peterborough Chronicle
 Version F
 see F Chronicle, under Canterbury
 Baldwin, abbot of St Edmunds, obit 54
 Bede, the Venerable
 Historia Ecclesiastica 1, 108 n.23, 126
 historical tradition of 29, 84, 124, 125, 126
 Lives of the Abbots of Wearmouth and Jarrow 36–7
 Beonna, abbot of Peterborough 40
 Canterbury
 Charters 113–17
 Elections 69, 93
 F Chronicle 1, 2, 5, 7, 11, 14, 15, 28, 43, 55, 56, 59, 60, 102, 103, 104, 109, 111, 113, 114–18, 119, 132, 134, 135, 136, 137, 140, 145, 168
 Movement of texts to Peterborough 111–13, 117, 118, 144
 Other chronicling associated with 11, 12, 15, 122, 127, 142
 Ceolred, abbot of Peterborough 33, 40
 Charters
 Creating geographical space 34, 38, 41, 47, 57, 58, 135, 165, 168
 Forgeries 3, 25, 26, 27, 34 n.50, 35
 see also Diplomas, charters *under* Canterbury, charters *under* Peterborough abbey
 Compiler
 Role in medieval texts 101–4, 139–140
 see also *F Chronicle* *under* Canterbury, *Peterborough Chronicle*
Cura Pastoralis
 Alfred's translation of 48
 Cyneburh, St, sister of Wulfhere 30–1 n.40, 40, 50, 163, 164

Index

- see also* Saints' relics *under*
 Peterborough abbey
 Cyneswith, St, sister of Wulfhere 30–1
 n.40, 40, 50, 163, 164
see also Saints' relics *under*
 Peterborough abbey
 Cynewulf, feud with Cyneheard 6, 30
 n.39, 41

 David, King of Scotland 63, 67 n.26
 Diplomas
 form and function 34, 35, 36, 58
 n.137, 74, 99, 108, 110, 114, 133,
 135

 Eadmer 75, 76, 124
 account of Anselm 103
 Earnwig, abbot of Peterborough 55
 Edgar, King
 Grant of 23, 38–9, 45, 66, 150, 155,
 157 n.53
 Edward the Confessor 50 n.111, 55,
 117
 Emma, Queen 50, 158
 Ernulf, prior of Canterbury and abbot of
 Peterborough 3, 42, 49, 52, 69, 70,
 111, 113, 149, 152
 E-text
 see under Peterborough Chronicle
 Etheldreda of Ely, St 163
 see also Liber Eliensis
 Eugenius, pope
 Bulls of 90, 157, 166

 Florentin, St 50, 158, 162
 see also Saints' relics *under*
 Peterborough abbey

 Genre
 Classical theories 132–3
 Hybridity
 Formalist critique 141
 In the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* 5,
 18, 19, 42, 57–8, 60, 99, 105, 110,
 135–42, 144, 146, 171
 In medieval texts 59, 132–4, 145
 Mouvance / Variance 139–40
Gesta Herewardi 45 n.93, 144, 152
 see also Hereward the Wake
Gesta Stephani 86, 93
 see also Anarchy *under* Stephen

 Henry I, King of England 9, 92, 96, 98,
 137, 152, 160
 Henry II, King of England 4, 26, 82, 84,
 91, 92, 96, 97, 98, 99, 132, 137, 143,
 147
 Henry of Huntingdon 2, 17, 21, 43, 59,
 67, 75, 120, 122, 123, 125, 127, 129,
 130, 134, 137, 138, 142, 169
 Historia Anglorum 64, 126, 130
 Henry of Saint-Jean-d'Angély, also abbot
 of Peterborough 67, 70, 76, 78–81,
 82, 90, 95, 99, 160
 Hereward the Wake
 raid on Peterborough abbey 28, 42,
 44–9, 53, 58, 69, 70, 77, 96, 118,
 151, 152, 158, 160, 161
 Hugh Candidus
 Author 146, 149–50
 House-history of *Hugh Candidus* 3,
 18, 26, 27, 32, 33, 37, 39, 40, 44, 46,
 47, 50, 52, 57, 78, 90, 96, 99, 110,
 120, 137, 141, 146, 147, 148
 land grants 155–9
 Relationship with the *Peterborough*
 Chronicle 142, 150–5
 Saints and relics 160–8
 Hugo Albus, *see under* Hugh Candidus

 John of Crema 66, 67, 129
 John of Worcester 2, 17, 21, 28, 43, 59,
 74, 94, 120, 122–4, 125, 126, 127, 128,
 137, 138, 169
 Chronicle of John of Worcester 64,
 122–3, 128, 129
 John, abbot of Peterborough 52, 69, 76,
 157 n.52

 Leofric, abbot of Peterborough 51, 53,
 69, 156, 157 n.54
Liber Eliensis 24 n.11, 26, 32, 45 n.93
Liber Niger 3, 13, 27, 32, 38, 40, 42, 57,
 66, 83, 107, 108, 109, 110, 113, 116,
 119, 120, 136, 137, 143, 145, 148, 149,
 154, 165, 168, 170, 171
 Linguistic registers 66–8, 72, 73, 91–2,
 102, 109, 169

 Margaret, queen of Scotland 13, 123
 Marianus Scotus 123, 124
 Martin, abbot of Peterborough 3, 24

Index

- n.13, 89–90, 91–2, 98, 131, 157, 158
 n.57, 161
Matricularium 107
 Matthew, abbot of Peterborough 44, 54,
 57, 69, 70
 Matthew Ridel, abbot of Peterborough
 157 n.52, 167
Maxims II 12, 13
Menologium 12
- Offa, king of Mercia 40, 41
 Orderic Vitalis 59, 75, 78
 Oswald of Northumbria, St
 Arm of 47, 158, 161, 167
see also Saints' relics under
 Peterborough abbey
- Peada, King of Mercia 29, 32 n.42, 68
 n.28
 Peterborough abbey
 also known as *Burch* 40, 48, 50
 n.110, 80, 91, 157, 164
 also known as *Medeshamstede* 29, 32,
 34, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 44 n.88, 45,
 57, 66, 68, 107, 117, 137, 150, 166
 charters of 23, 27–42, 44, 57, 61,
 100, 108, 109, 113, 115, 116, 132,
 135, 143, 144, 147, 148, 150, 151,
 155, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 170,
 171
 fire at 2, 27, 53, 69, 76, 90, 107, 112,
 160
 Saints' relics 50, 159–68
 Scribes at 18, 61, 81–2, 83 n.81, 105–10
 Texts, *see* *Relatio Heddae*, *Liber Niger*,
Matricularium, *Peterborough*
Chronicle, house history of *Hugh*
Candidus under *Hugh Candidus*,
Walter of Whittlesey, *Robert of*
Swaffham
- Peterborough Chronicle*
 First Continuation 4, 19, 22, 62–81,
 82, 83, 85, 88, 90, 92, 93, 94, 95, 97,
 98, 99, 102, 103, 106, 107, 128, 129,
 162, 169
 Interpolations 1, 3, 4, 16, 18, 22–57,
 58, 59, 61, 62, 63, 65, 66, 68, 69, 70,
 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 80, 81, 83,
 85, 87, 88, 92, 93, 94, 95, 97, 98, 99,
 102, 103, 106, 107, 108, 114, 117,
 118, 119, 135, 151, 169
- Language of 61–2
 Proto-E 1, 2, 13, 14, 18, 22, 30, 43,
 45, 55, 56, 61, 63, 64, 71, 72, 73, 89,
 102, 105, 106, 111, 117, 118, 119,
 121, 122, 124, 125, 126, 127, 129,
 130, 131, 138, 141, 142, 144, 166,
 168, 169
 Second Continuation 4, 62, 63,
 81–100, 106, 109, 143, 154
see also Relationship with the
Peterborough Chronicle under house
 history of *Hugh Candidus*
- Portents
 First Continuation 69, 159–60
 Interpolations 52, 54, 56
 Second Continuation 94, 159–60
- Ralph, archbishop of Canterbury 69
 Ramsey, abbey of 158, 164
Chronicon Abbataiae Rameseiensis 25,
 26, 147, 148
 Reinaldus Spiritus, sacrist at
 Peterborough and brother of *Hugh*
Candidus 149, 161
Relatio Heddae 3, 23, 27, 32, 33, 35, 36,
 38, 57, 108, 109, 110, 115, 116, 119,
 120, 136, 143, 145, 148, 149, 150, 155,
 156, 165, 168
 Robert Bloet, bishop of Lincoln 65, 74,
 129, 130
 Robert of Normandy 64, 67 n.26
 Robert of Swaffham
 Cartulary of 40, 143, 146, 147, 150,
 152, 155, 166
 Roger, bishop of Salisbury 129
- Seaxwulf, founder of *Medeshamstede* 29,
 36, 98, 115
 Simeon of Durham 85–6
 Stephen, king of England 25, 87, 91, 93,
 96, 97, 98, 99, 131, 137, 148, 154, 160,
 161, 165, 170
 Anarchy under 25, 82, 84–91, 93, 94,
 95, 97, 98, 99, 130, 131, 132, 137,
 148, 154, 160, 163, 167, 169, 170
- Thurstan, abbot of Glastonbury 54
 Tibba, St, relative of *Wulfhere* 40, 50,
 164
see also Saints' relics under
 Peterborough abbey

Index

- Topoi*, events used as
 First Continuation 69–71, 72, 73, 81, 102, 169
 Interpolations 52–6, 58, 65, 69, 102
 Second Continuation 94–6
Turolde, abbot of Peterborough 28, 47, 54, 126 n.98
Walter of Whittlesey
 Cartulary of 33, 143, 146, 147, 150, 155, 156, 166
Waverley Annals 2, 17, 43, 45, 50, 53, 55, 56, 57, 118, 121, 122, 132, 142, 169
William of Norwich, St 162–3, 166
William of St Barbe, bishop of Durham 85–6
William of Corbeil, archbishop of Canterbury 129
William of Waterville, abbot of Peterborough 91, 143, 149, 166
William the Conqueror 51
 Domesday survey 23, 45, 54, 123
 Norman Conquest 9, 23, 26, 52, 53, 69, 170
William of Malmesbury 17, 59, 84, 87, 120, 122, 123, 124–5, 126, 127, 128, 134, 137, 138, 169
William Rufus, king of England 54, 160
Wulfhere, king of Mercia 23, 115, 163, 164
 Grant of 30–6, 37, 38, 41, 68, 93
 see also charters *under* Peterborough Abbey
Yware, monk of Peterborough 47, 151, 158